

The American Historical Review

Board of Editors

GEORGE B. ADAMS

GEORGE L. BURR

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN

WILLIAM M. SLOANE

Managing Editor

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOL. XIV NO. 2

JANUARY 1909

ISSUED QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

GEORGE B. ADAMS	History and the Philosophy of History	221
GERHARD SEELIGER	The State and Seigniorial Authority in Early German History	237
ALEXANDER BUGGE	The Origin and Credibility of the Icelandic Saga	249
J. HOLLAND ROSE	Great Britain and the Dutch Question in 1787-1788	262
CHARLES O. PAULLIN	President Lincoln and the Navy	284
DOCUMENTS—Letters of General Thomas Williams, 1862, contributed by G. Mott Williams, Bishop of Marquette.		304
REVIEWS OF BOOKS—Jullian's <i>Histoire de la Gaule</i> , II.; Maitland's <i>Constitutional History of England</i> ; Green's <i>The Making of Ireland and its Undoing</i> ; Corbett's <i>England in the Seven Years' War</i> ; Documents <i>Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française</i> ; Cromer's <i>Modern Egypt</i> ; MacNutt's <i>Letters of Cortes</i> ; Channing's <i>History of the United States</i> , II.; Coolidge's <i>United States as a World Power</i> .		329
(For a complete list of reviews see next page.)		
NOTES AND NEWS		397

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

41 NORTH QUEEN ST., LANCASTER, PA.

64-66 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Entered at the post-office, Lancaster, Pa., as second-class mail matter.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Taylor, <i>The Science of Jurisprudence</i>	329
Reich, <i>General History of Western Nations</i> , I., II., by Professor G. W. Botsford	331
<i>The Imperial Gazetteer of India</i> , II.	333
Déchelette, <i>Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique</i> , I., by Professor F. N. Robinson	334
Jullian, <i>Histoire de la Gaule</i> , II., by the same	335

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Maitland, <i>Constitutional History of England</i> , by Professor G. B. Adams	338
Hazeltine, <i>Geschichte des Englischen Pfandrechts</i> , by Professor N. M. Trenholme	339
Green, <i>The Making of Ireland and its Undoing</i> , by Professor E. P. Cheyney	341
Putnam, <i>Charles the Bold</i> , by Professor J. W. Thompson	343
Shield and Lang, <i>The King over the Water</i> , by Dr. J. P. Warren	344
Corbett, <i>England in the Seven Years' War</i> , by T. W. Riker	345
Egerton, <i>Historical Geography of the British Colonies</i> , vol. V., pt. II., by Professor Adam Shortt	349
<i>Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution</i> , by Professor J. H. Robinson	350
Benn, <i>Modern England</i>	355
Cromer, <i>Modern Egypt</i> , by the Right Hon. James Bryce	357

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

MacNutt, <i>Letters of Cortes</i>	362
Channing, <i>History of the United States</i> , II.	364
Cushing, <i>Writings of Samuel Adams</i> , IV.	366
Hunt, <i>John C. Calhoun</i> , by Dr. Frederic Bancroft	368
Johnson, <i>Stephen A. Douglas</i> , by Professor F. H. Hodder	369
Phillips, <i>History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt</i>	371
Coolidge, <i>The United States as a World Power</i> , by Professor A. S. Hershey	372
MINOR NOTICES	375
TEXT-BOOKS	395

The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW to all its members; the Executive Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW may be sent to the Managing Editor, Professor J. F. Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C., or to the Board of Editors. Books for review may be sent to the Managing Editor. Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa., or 66 Fifth Ave., New York. The price of subscription, to persons who are not members of the American Historical Association, is four dollars a year; single numbers are sold for one dollar; bound volumes may be obtained for four dollars and a half. Back numbers or volumes of the REVIEW may be obtained at the same rates.

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

THE NEW ERA PRINT,
LANCASTER, PA.

The

American Historical Review

HISTORY AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY¹

“GOD has conceded two sights to a man—
One of man's whole work, time's completed plan,
The other of the minute's work, man's first
Step to the plan's completeness.”

These words are from the great philosophical poet of the nineteenth century, from Browning's *Sordello*. They are the words of a poet, who sees before him in a vision the whole of human history, as if it were the sure unfolding of a foreordained plan, bringing steadily on “one far-off, divine event, to which the whole creation moves”. In other ages besides our time, in other lands besides the fatherland of the two whose words I have used, many poets have seen this vision. But not the poet alone has seen it. Philosopher and theologian have shared it with him. Ever since the broadening union of the ancient world brought to men an understanding of the common interests and common destinies of men of diverse races, this has been so. From the time when Vergil put into the mouth of the father of gods and men his prediction of an unending empire for his hero's progeny, from the time when men spoke commonly of the eternal city, and when Christian thought made the conception its own in the idea of the eternal city of God and of righteousness, absorbing into itself in process of time all manner of men that dwell

¹ Annual address of the president of the American Historical Association, delivered at Richmond, December 29, 1908.

The best introduction to the discussion and to the literature of this subject for the historian is to be found in Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode*, third and fourth editions, 1903; fifth and sixth, 1908. Bernheim's bibliographical references and comment are very helpful. Professor Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History* will also be found useful in introductory study, both on the bibliographical side, and as giving a very clear idea of the ideas and aims of one portion of the new movement in the field of history. It will be understood that in this paper I have in mind American conditions in the field of historical study.

on the face of the earth, from those days until now poets, philosophers and theologians have never ceased to behold and to proclaim a destined and knowable outcome for the efforts of mankind—a philosophy of history.

And why should they not? It is in truth a most alluring vision for any man. The mystery of the life of the race, of the final outcome of men's works and dominions, presses constantly upon us. Do all our ends and efforts tend only to temporary results, to certain reaction, and at last to the dead silence of the moon, or to a millennial age of universal good to whose more speedy coming all the generations contribute? Any answer to this question is sure of a hearing. The temptation to try to solve the problem, we all of us know at times.

But this is to be remembered, professed historians have given very little attention to this side of their subject. The men who have made it their special business to compile and preserve the record of the past action of the race, who would claim for themselves a peculiar right to the name of historians, have not concerned themselves with final results. If we add to the idea of the philosophy of history, as we ought, the related idea of the science of history, to make it include the process as well as the result, to include the question of the operation of law in history, the fact is the same. Turn over the pages of Flint's *History of the Philosophy of History*, and you will find that the names of historians are conspicuous by their absence. Without attempting any minute analysis, or close classification, we may say that historians who wrote before the nineteenth century fall into one or the other of two groups: first, those whose object was primarily to make the record of past events, to tell the story, to let posterity know what happened, without ulterior design; and second, those who were first of all anxious to produce literature, who desired indeed to tell the truth about the actions they described and to make them known to the future, but whose controlling motive was art rather than knowledge, the hope of earning name and fame for themselves among the great writers of the day. In neither of these classes do we find men who have greatly concerned themselves either with the science or the philosophy of history. They have merely endeavored to tell artlessly, or with all possible art, what happened.

About eighty years ago a new and profound influence began to make itself felt upon those who were engaged in studying and recording what had happened in the past. It was an influence towards more scientific methods of studying the facts of history. I am sure I do not need to describe to this audience the ideals of

the young Ranke, in the twenties of the last century, nor their results for historical studies. They have indeed been described better than I could do it, in an earlier meeting of this Association, by one whose voice we shall not hear again, and whose own fine examples of scientific work remain as models and incentives to us all.² I do not mean to say that this great movement of the nineteenth century in the field of our interest was due to Ranke alone. It was not. But it was due to him more than to any other one man and we may most easily associate it with his name. I have called this movement scientific, but it should be clearly perceived that I am using this word now with a very different range of meaning from that in which I used it a moment ago when I said "the science of history". It is one thing to raise the question, Is human action dominated by law, and can we by discovering those laws construct a science of history, in the sense in which there exists a science of chemistry? It is quite a different thing to ask, Can methods of investigation which are strictly scientific be applied to the study of the past action of the race, in such a way as to give our knowledge of what happened greater certainty? The school of Ranke has never endeavored to go beyond this last question, but their answer to it has been a clear and, I believe, an indisputable affirmative. The actual result has been a science of investigation, and a method of training the future historian, which, it is not too much to say, have taken complete possession of the world of historical scholarship. At any rate it is true that all technically trained historians for more than fifty years have been trained according to these ideas and they have all found it exceedingly difficult to free themselves from the fundamental principle of their school that the first duty of the historian is to ascertain as nearly as possible and to record exactly what happened. It is not likely that historians of such training will be found to have concerned themselves with the problems of the science or of the philosophy of history to any greater extent than did their predecessors of earlier time. It remains true then that down to the present time professed historians have not dealt with these questions. They have left them to poets, philosophers and theologians.

But perfection of the methods of investigation is not the only result of the nineteenth century which affects our field of work. During the last four decades of that century, and especially during its last quarter, there arose a variety of new interests, new groups of scholars formed themselves, new points of view were occupied,

² Edward G. Bourne, *Leopold von Ranke, Annual Report of the American Historical Association* (1896), I. 67-81.

new methods were loudly proclaimed, new sciences were born and named, all concerned with the same facts of the past which it is our business to study. So closely are these new interests related to us, and to one another, in the common body of material which we must all use, that we are tempted to call them offshoots of history, to say that our broad field has begun to be divided, surveyed out into independent domains, as the still broader field once called philosophy has been dividing itself through many centuries; but the statement, though tempting, would be, at least of some of these branches, neither historically nor logically correct. Certainly their attitude towards traditional history has not been that of dutiful children towards a parent. So uniformly and severely critical have they been of the methods and purposes of the political historian, if we may use that term as a means of differentiation for the historian by name and profession, that we may almost regard their rise as an attack upon our position, systematic and concerted, and from various points at once.³ This is hardly the literal truth and yet it behooves us to understand clearly that after three-quarters of a century of practically undisputed possession of our great field of study, during which the achievements of the political historian have won the admiration and applause of the world, our right to the field is now called in question, our methods, our results and our ideals are assailed, and we are being thrown upon the defensive at many points.

The whole of this hostile movement, to continue for convenience to call it so, I do not here propose to review, but there are five lines of attack so interesting in themselves, and possessing in common so many of the features to which I wish to call especial attention, that I will ask your indulgence while I consider them in brief detail. I shall take them up in the inverse order of their own hostility to us and of the vigor of their attack.

The first to be considered then is political science. The political scientists may, with some show of justice, dispute my right to place their subject in this list. If we consider the unconnected work of individual students, it is by far the oldest of the five; and towards the work of the historian its attitude is less that of hostility than of patronizing condescension. But as a consciously organized body of knowledge and of workers this division is hardly older than the dates I have specified, and in many of its members the tendency is strong to assume that the chief end to be served by the historian is to furnish material for their science, or to put it in different phrase, that all political history is merely the effort of mankind to give objective form to the principles which political science seeks to state;

³ Bernheim, *Lehrbuch* (1903), pp. 76-126; (1908), pp. 85-145.

that history finds its explanation in these principles, that its laws will be formulated by their statement, and that the philosophy of history is the philosophy of the state.

The second movement upon our position, somewhat more aggressive in spirit, is that of the geographers. With something of the ardor of new discovery, seeming to forget that many of the suggestions which they make are also old, though their organization into a systematic whole may be comparatively new, they appear to me to be sometimes tempted by their enthusiasm to make more sweeping statements than they intend, and to advance claims of whose exact bearing they are hardly conscious. What they offer us, in the form of words they use, is a complete explanation of history. Civilization or the lack of civilization is determined by the physical surroundings and the climatic influences in which the different tribes of men have found themselves. I cannot forbear quoting a passage from a recent book, because it illustrates so well both the character of the claims advanced and the unconscious carelessness of statement in which they are made. I must add that the book is not to be judged by this quotation. The main portion of it is an unusually valuable piece of work, almost extraordinary in some respects, which has received, I do not doubt, the praise which it deserves. The scientific part of the book is as easily separated from the theoretical as the business part of the Declaration of Independence from the speculative philosophy with which it opens. Says the author: "If Percival Lowell is right, it is the dry climate of Mars which has caused the inhabitants of that planet to adopt an advanced form of social organization, where war is unknown, and each man must be keenly conscious of the interdependence of himself and the universal state." You will notice that the only point upon which any doubt is expressed is the dry climate of Mars. The civilization of that planet is known to possess certain characteristics and these may be fully accounted for by a given climate, if it exists. Now it needs no proof that the author did not intend to say exactly what he has said, but the statement is fairly typical both in the nature of the claim advanced and in the expression which is given to it. For our purpose at present, I repeat, the geographers offer us an explanation of history purporting to be adequate to account for the achievements of the race.

The third attack upon us is more formidable than either of these two. It comes from an intellectual movement which is wide in its scope, which has a truly comprehensive idea of history, and which deals with influences among the most profound which have shaped human affairs. I refer to the attempted economic explana-

tion of history, but I beg you at the outset to make a distinction. The historian of the old school, the traditional historian, has no more valuable ally than the economic historian. He whose work it is to show us how in specific cases economic forces have determined events, who helps us to understand how the facts with which we deal came to be what they are, is doing with new tools and fresh vision the same work with ourselves. The strictest disciple of the school of Ranke has never supposed that the knowledge of what happened could be made complete without the knowledge of how it happened. We do not count the economic historian proper among those who would drive us from the field. Let me ask you to notice clearly, however, that there is a great difference between economic history and that which calls itself the economic interpretation of history. So far-reaching have been the discoveries of the economic historian, so profound the influences whose operation he has uncovered, so satisfactory the explanations which he offers, that it is not strange if many have found here the final explanation of history, nor that all types of thought have been attracted to this philosophy, from the cold pessimism of Ferrero to the exuberant optimism of Professor Simon Patten. The economic interpretation of history has come to be a standard formula, and the explanation offered is in form complete. By de Graf, by Labriola, we are told that even the ideal world is the economic world; that all our notions, beliefs, sciences, manners, morals, law and philosophy find there their first explanation. Labriola calls the Reformation an economic rebellion of the German nation; E. V. Robinson in an engaging essay illustrates in the history of war the statement that the fundamental fact in history is the law of diminishing returns; Durkheim asserts that history is the progress of the principle of division of labor; while Marx declares that the history of every society up to our day has been only the history of the conflict of classes. Notice, if you please, that what we have in all these cases is once more an attempt to explain history, to get at the fundamental forces which are at work in it, to formulate the philosophy, or the science of history.

The fourth line of advance upon the historian's position is that of sociology. Let me hasten to relieve your minds of the apprehension that I am going to try to tell you what is the field of the sociologist. He is indeed lord of an uncharted domain, and I have no intention of attempting to supply him with a chart. But for our purpose an adequate statement of the ultimate objects sought has been made by a sociologist of high repute, well known to the members of this Association. According to Professor Giddings "sociology is an attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure and

activities of society by the operation of physical, vital, and psychical causes, working together in the process of evolution.”⁴ Professor Giddings’s own formulation of the fundamental law of kind; Kidd’s *Social Evolution* with its brilliant interpretation of the function of religion in history; and Forrest’s *Development of Western Civilization* with its attempt to apply still more abstract metaphysics to history, to use only examples with which we are all no doubt familiar, show that Professor Giddings’s statement of the purpose of sociology is amply confirmed. It is clear once more that what this aggressive and vigorous school of thought is seeking is an ultimate explanation of human history.

Fifth, and last, youngest of all in its advance into the field of history, is the group of the folk-psychologists, or, to call them by the better name which has more recently come into use, the social psychologists. Starting with the psychology of the individual man, modified in manifestation, law and power, as we know it to be when individuals are combined into the mass, so that there are created by a geometrically increasing force resulting from the process of union, new traits, new purposes and new energy, the social psychologists would explain great race characteristics, Roman conquest, Italian art, English literature, great historic movements, advance and reaction, Reformation and Counter-Reformation, by psychic forces whose laws of action they would formulate. They even find in the principles of their science the chief differentia of historic periods and call one age that of “conventionalism” and another that of “subjectivism”. I hardly need to remind you that here again the main endeavor of this new movement is to construct a science, or a philosophy of history.

May I pause here to ask you to notice two things? In the first place, in naming these five lines of new approach to history, I have made no attempt to characterize any of them fully. I have had in view only a special object which must be already apparent, and I have had also the general purpose of calling attention to this almost concerted movement in our field of study of which I think American students of history have taken too little notice, less notice at least than has been given to it by our colleagues in France and Germany. In the second place, in distinguishing these five from one another, I have not intended to imply that each stands wholly by itself. They do in fact overlap and cover much common territory, and even trespass upon the private preserves one of another. And yet each has some original and supplementary contribution to make to the common effort, which none of the others can furnish.

⁴ *The Principles of Sociology* (1896), p. 8.

May I delay still further to point out to you where you may find this fact, of the independence and at the same time the interdependence of these groups, strikingly illustrated, as well as the other fact that sociology, perhaps from its all-containing and somewhat indefinite nature, is in a way already the mediating, unifying group, and may go far in a final synthesis to bring the others into unity within itself. I find this illustration in the two great histories which at least this newly allied advance into the historical domain has already produced. Great they certainly are, however much we may disagree with their methods or their results, and they are especially interesting as the first promise of the harvest which the new culture may bring forth. The one is Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte*; the other is Ferrero's *Grandezza e Decadenza di Roma*. So unlike are these two works in their surface characteristics that it may occasion some surprise to find them placed together, and yet the sure sense of general criticism has already made that classification. Lamprecht is a trained historian, inclining strongly in his early studies to economic history, tending to find in the stages of economic advance his first organization of the facts of history, but seeming now to have found the principles of social psychology more profoundly controlling. He still calls himself a historian, but he has been, nevertheless, often called by his critics a sociologist. Ferrero began as a sociologist and his first writings were contributions to the literature of that subject. Some of his critics say that he selected history as a field of study in order to illustrate in it the laws of sociology, but in his history of Rome the controlling forces which he finds in operation are economic, and he deals little in the psychology of the mass, though much in that of the individual. Ferrero's work is much more like that of the traditional historian than Lamprecht's. In it, specific statements of fact are more numerous, and wide generalities form a less proportion of the whole, but one does not need to read far in either book to perceive the controlling influence of the imagination in the new history in comparison with the stricter scientific faculties, and the constant occurrence of sweeping generalizations, charming to the reader and attractive to the mind, until they are submitted to cold analysis. My purpose here, however, is not to criticize, it is rather to call your attention to these two works, most stimulating to thought, which it will be found useful to read together and to compare with one another if one desires to understand the methods and character of much history that will be written in the near future.

You will have seen by this time, I am sure, that in my opinion this allied attack upon the field of history by the five divisions whose

advance I have briefly sketched is not an affair of the moment, but formidable in character and likely to last at least one swing of the pendulum of time. Are we not indeed forced to ask if this phrase does not imply something of its real character? Is it a swinging back of the pendulum? Is this disturbance in our province, this recrudescence of philosophy, symptomatic of what is occurring in the whole realm of thought? Are we passing from an age of investigation to an age of speculation? There are I think on all sides, in many ways, signs that this may very possibly be the case. My immediate predecessor in this office paid his respects to the vagaries of Christian Science. I do not think he would disagree with me in seeing in the wide vogue of that cult a significant sign of far-reaching popular reaction away from science towards speculation. Christian Science as properly calls itself Christian as any of its pietistic forerunners in the history of religion, but it ludicrously miscalls itself science. It is rather, as a little intelligent study of its literature makes clear, a denial of validity to the fundamental principles upon which all science rests. Even in the field of physical science itself, in some of its most rapidly advancing branches, in the writings of some who are considered among its foremost representatives, there may be seen some faint signs of a similar revival of philosophy in speculations on the immortality of the soul, on the earth as the only abode of life, on the habitability of Mars, and in some of those on the ultimate bearings of the discovery of radium.

Whether this be true or not, and the prediction of a general reaction is too venturesome to be made here, it seems certain to me at least that in our own field a reaction is well under way and not to be avoided. For more than fifty years the historian has had possession of the field and has deemed it his sufficient mission to determine what the fact was, including the immediate conditions which gave it shape. Now he finds himself confronted with numerous groups of aggressive and confident workers in the same field who ask not what was the fact—many of them seem to be comparatively little interested in that—but their constant question is what is the ultimate explanation of history, or, more modestly, what are the forces which determine human events and according to what laws do they act. This is nothing else than a new flaming up of interest in the philosophy, or the science of history. No matter what disguise may be worn in a given case, no matter what the name may be by which a given group elects to call itself, no matter how small, in the immensity of influences which make the whole, may be the force in which it would find the final explanation of history, the emphatic assertion which they all make is that history is the orderly progression of

mankind to a definite end, and that we may know and state the laws which control the actions of men in organized society. This is the one common characteristic of all the groups I have described; and it is of each of them the one most prominent characteristic. We must also recognize the special significance of the fact that this demand for a philosophy of history is not now made by poets, philosophers, or theologians. The men who make it invoke the name of science. Some of them indeed acknowledge a close alliance with the philosophers and conjure much with metaphysics, but others of the same name will warmly repudiate such an alliance and speak of metaphysics in disrespectful language. All alike, however, lay claim in special degree to the methods, purposes and results of science as their own. All of them seem to look with more or less well-concealed contempt on the historian, and to regard their own work as of a higher type, more truly scientific, and more nearly final in character than ours.

What is the historian to do about it? It is useless to pooh-pooh this movement, or to underestimate it, to call it a passing wave of thought which will soon sink to its real level and lose the relative importance which it now assumes. It must be confessed that this is the attitude which trained historians, at least those of us who have lived most of our active lives in the sharper air of science, are still inclined to take. But it is an impossible attitude. The new interpretation of history brings us too much that is convincing, despite all the mere speculation that goes with it; its contribution to a better understanding of our problems is already too valuable; we are ourselves too clearly conscious in these later days of the tangled network of influences we are striving to unravel; of the hidden forces upon the borders of whose action we arrive in our own explorations, to justify us in ignoring or in denying the worth of those results which are reached by other ways than ours. We may perhaps find warrant for an exercise of discrimination, which does not always seem possible to them, but further than that it is not likely that we can go.

Nor is it of any use to deny the possibility of a science, or a philosophy of history. The existence of such a possibility is one of the most profound questions which has ever occupied human thought. Since man first began to ask about the destiny of the race, as I have already said, he has been trying to find the answer, and some of the most comprehensive philosophic systems that have been constructed in the history of thought, like that of Hegel for instance, are really nothing more than attempts to formulate, and show the operation of, the one controlling principle that has shaped all human achievement, or indeed all action, material as well as human, since the spirit of

God first moved upon the face of the waters. The revived interest in this problem during the past twenty-five years has already produced a great literature. If we do not misread the signs of the present they point plainly to a still more active discussion of this question during the next twenty-five years, and to a still larger literature about it. Whatever may be true of those of us who may now look forward to the not distant enjoyment of a well-earned pension, it certainly behooves the young historian to obtain a clear understanding of exactly what this question means, and what its relation is to the work which he proposes to do.

The question what the science, or philosophy of history is, or whether such things are possible to our knowledge, I do not propose to discuss here. It would be absurd within the limits of time, it would be equally absurd within the limits of the occasion of this address to undertake such a discussion. And did time and the stage both permit, such a discussion could only be undertaken by one who had devoted long study to the question, as I certainly have not. There are, however, certain distinctions which it seems necessary to make at the outset of all thinking on the subject, which may perhaps well be stated by an outsider and which may be found useful by the historian who is often puzzled, I think, by the things which are said by the newcomers about his field of work.

In the first place, the phrase "the science of history" is used in contemporary discussion in certain quite distinct meanings which it should be the first duty of the disputant who speaks in the name of science to discriminate and keep clearly apart in his argument. They are, however, as a matter of fact oftentimes so inextricably mixed that not merely is the reader confused, but it is evident that the writer's own thought has arrived at no clear understanding of the terms he is using. One of these meanings we have in the question, Is history a science or an art? I should feel that I ought to apologize for raising this question here, had not so much been written upon it. To any clear thinking, in my opinion, the question is absurd, and one with which no working historian need concern himself. It attempts to make a distinction which does not exist. It goes on the supposition that two things are mutually exclusive between which there exists no incompatibility, no antithesis, no contradiction. It carries on its face the indication that he who asks it is thinking chiefly of history as a branch of literature and that he has no clear conception of what he means by history as a science, for certainly whether he means this phrase to refer to the method of collecting historical material, or to the character of the problems which history raises, history as an art is not thereby affected. Any

historian, of any school of thought, may make his history art if he is able to do so. History must remain one of the highest branches of literature. In some future time the drama of human action on the stage of the world's history will be unfolded in a great work of art, immortal in itself like all great works of art, but this will only be when the facts of history which are necessary to its truth, and therefore to its permanence as art, are finally established. Till that time comes the work of the man who writes history as literature will be more ephemeral than that of the man who records his scientific work upon the facts of the past, even though the latter's monograph be forgotten and his name perish. May I add that the approach of that day is not hastened by the criticisms of estimable gentlemen who desire to find, in pleasant reading, relaxation and entertainment at the close of an arduous day and to cherish at the same time the fond imagination that they are cultivating their minds in the acquirement of historical knowledge? It would seem at times as if this were the source from which comes at present the chief demand for history as an art, and as if this were the audience chiefly sought by the artistic historian. I would not, however, unduly disparage the writing of history as literature. I do desire to emphasize strongly the difference between the literary historian and the one whose ambition it is not to produce fine art but to add something to the sum of human knowledge.

A second use of the phrase "the science of history" is with reference to the method of historical investigation and to the validity of its results. In ascertaining and classifying the objective facts with which history deals can methods which are really scientific be employed—and this includes the somewhat different and subordinate question, can the same methods be employed as in the ascertaining and classifying of facts in the natural and physical sciences? Upon our answer to this question depends our answer to another; *viz.*, have the conclusions established by these methods a degree of validity really scientific? These questions are of course most fundamental for every man who concerns himself with the facts of history, no matter from what point of view he regards them. The answer which is to be given to them is of vital importance alike to the political historian and to the sociologist, but it should be clearly perceived that they concern methods of work only and the trustworthiness of data. They are wholly different questions from that which is raised by the five groups of students whom I have especially named in their demand for a science of history, and the unqualified affirmative with which, as I have already said, I believe we must answer the former questions, has no bearing on our mental

attitude towards the latter demand. Nor has it indeed upon the somewhat different and subordinate question whether the scientific method of historical investigation is the same as that employed in the natural and physical sciences. Upon this question I have nothing to say in this place.

A third meaning of the phrase "the science of history" is that in which the sociologist or the social psychologist uses it when he is speaking with care. In this sense it raises the question, Are the objective facts with which the historian deals, the past actions of the race, determined in their occurrence by forces acting according to fixed laws, and similar in character and method of operation to the forces which are at work in the sphere of the natural and physical sciences? This is the one question which the new movement in history, from the days of Comte and Buckle, has persistently pushed to the front. It is towards the solution of this question that, in my opinion, its most important contributions have been made, more important than the light, nevertheless great, which it has thrown on particular historical problems, and also notwithstanding the baseless speculation which has attended, and does attend, its work. This is, in my opinion again, the most proper meaning of the phrase "the science of history", and the possibility of such a science I believe to be the great question of the future in the new study and writing of history. May I venture to say that I am convinced that in this sense history is a science, that the events with which it is concerned have been determined by forces which act according to fixed law, and that most of the objections which have been urged against this view are due to misapprehensions, or incomplete reflection?

If a fourth point to which I would call attention is not strictly speaking a distinct meaning of the phrase "the science of history", it is an idea which has played a large part in the discussion of the subject. This is the assertion that even if laws control the destinies of men, those laws are unknowable, that no amount of investigation and study will ever enable us to formulate them, or to come to a knowledge of the great system, the universe of conscious action, in which they work together in one harmonious whole. While I believe it is possible to show that an argument of this kind is also founded on misapprehension, my purpose here is merely to point out that however clearly one may seem to prove that the laws of history are beyond our grasp, he has taken no step towards proving that they do not exist; this argument should be confined to showing that a science of history is beyond our comprehension and construction, and not be used to prove that there is in reality no such thing.

It is perhaps necessary to add that the objective existence of a science of history, if it were clearly established, would in its turn not prove that we are capable of its discovery and formulation.

These are, I am certain, clearly distinct shades of meaning which are suggested by the phrase "the science of history", and I believe it is of the greatest importance to keep them distinct in our thinking and writing, as certainly has not always been done. But if there are distinctions to be made in the term "science of history", what shall be said of the term "philosophy of history"? Here, however, I am not going to assert that a distinction really exists between the terms "science" and "philosophy", which have been used as synonymous by almost everyone who has written upon these problems. The most that I can say is that if such a distinction could be made on valid grounds it would be exceedingly useful. The key to the suggestion which I am going to venture upon is found in a passage which I quote from Flint's *History of the Philosophy of History*.⁵ He says: "As a rule, the historians who have had no explicit philosophy of history have had but a very meagre implicit one, and the aversion which they have shown to historical generalization has had its source mainly in their own want of generalizing power." To this I should like to add a quotation from the presidential address delivered to this Association by its first president, Andrew D. White. He said in 1884: "Buckle has shown that without a true historical synthesis special investigations and discoveries often lead us far from any valuable fruits, and that such special investigations may be worse than no investigations at all."⁶ Such authoritative assertions of the need of a guiding philosophy of history for the best historical work may seem rather discouraging to some of us, who have not been greatly conscious of any such need, but you will notice that both passages emphasize the importance of such a philosophy, as a help to generalization, for such I take it is the meaning of the quotation from President White's address. If now we turn for help in understanding these hard sayings to our brethren of the natural and physical sciences, whose older processes have received more conscious differentiation, I think we shall learn that the scientist in those fields distinguishes clearly between the actual scientific work which he is doing, and what he believes to be the ultimate drift of that work. He says: "These observed and measured facts I have in hand; this force, which I can isolate, acts always in this way; the law of its action I can state in these definite terms. These things make up my science." But over and beyond these things, he says:

⁵ *The History of the Philosophy of History: France* (1894), p. 14.

⁶ *Papers of the American Historical Association* (1885), I. 6.

"I believe such and such is the composition of the atom; such and such is the nature of matter and of force." But he mingles these two sets of conclusions in no intellectual confusion. He knows that his theory of the composition of the atom, of the nature of force, is no direct part of his scientific process. He understands that it is given him by the sudden leaping forward of the imagination to discern the yet distant end towards which the plodding steps of science seem to be tending. This is his philosophy of matter and of force. But though he perceives that he has not reached it by the same valid process as the facts he knows and the laws he can state, and though he holds it subject to instant modification when new discoveries of science open a vision of new results, his final philosophy of nature is nevertheless the master light of all his seeing; it shows the direction of each new step; it reveals to his search the unifying generalization which brings order into the mass of newly collected facts. If we are to distinguish between the science and the philosophy of history, this should be the function of the latter. Our philosophy of history should be our conviction as to the direction in which our scientific study is tending, our belief as to the ultimate nature of history and the final destinies of the race, our answer to the riddle of human existence. It should be to us a source of inspiration and of courage, but we should not confuse it with our science.

But I have not yet really answered my question, What should the historian do in view of the threatened invasion of his domain by ideals and methods not quite his own? I have been occupied in saying what and how he should think. For the young historian I cannot answer the question. I seem to see many an attempt by the trained historian proper to meet the leaders of the new movement, whether regarded as enemies or allies, with their own weapons, and to turn some of their positions into a part of our own line of defense. Every attempt to unite the old and the new, to find a common standing-ground for all workers at what are really common tasks, ought to secure the hearty support of all historians. The men who try this from our side will be found however in most cases, I believe, to be the younger men. To those whose methods of work are fixed, whose training in investigation makes change not easy, and who will perhaps feel some discouragement for their own science, as this new movement broadens and deepens, I have one word of comfort, and it is to me at least of large comfort. It is this. All science which is true science must rest upon the proved and correlated fact. It can have no other foundation than this. All premature generalization, all generalization from hasty observation, from half-understood facts, is useless and often worse than

useless. I am well aware that premature generalization, that wrong generalization, from misunderstood fact, is one of the necessary methods of scientific advance, but it is only so when it truly rests upon the best knowledge of the fact which contemporary science can furnish. At the very beginning of all conquest of the unknown lies the fact, established and classified to the fullest extent possible at the moment. To lay such foundations, to furnish such materials for later builders, may be a modest ambition, but it is my firm belief that in our field of history, for a long time to come, the man who devotes himself to such labors, who is content with this preliminary work, will make a more useful and a more permanent contribution to the final science, or philosophy of history, than will he who yields to the allurements of speculation and endeavors to discover in the present stage of our knowledge the forces that control society, or to formulate the laws of their action. None of the new battle-cries should sound for us above the call of our first leader, proclaiming the chief duty of the historian to establish *wie es eigentlich gewesen*. We have been told that to this should be added *wie es eigentlich geworden*; but let us not be deceived. To the true historian the being of a fact has always included all that portion of its becoming which belongs to the definite understanding of it. What is more than that we can safely leave to others. The field of the historian is, and must long remain, the discovery and recording of what actually happened.

But this does not preclude his cherishing a philosophy of history in the sense of Buckle, and Flint, and White, in the quotations I have just made. He may well hold to the belief that the facts which he is establishing tend to prove this or that final explanation of history. By such a belief his labors may be lightened and rendered more effective. In this sense it may indeed be true that God has conceded two sights to a man. One, of time's completed plan. That is our philosophy of history, under the stimulus of which we work. The other of the minute's work, man's first step to the plan's completeness. That is our daily labor in building up by long and right investigation the science of history.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

THE STATE AND SEIGNIORIAL AUTHORITY IN EARLY GERMAN HISTORY¹

EVEN in our days the ownership of land brings with it political advantages of many sorts. In earlier times this was much more the case; indeed, landed property was then often the very basis for the exercise of political rights. Especially was this true when lands accumulated in a single hand, and when therefore many people outside of the circle of family and household had fallen into a relation of dependence toward the owner and thus relations of seigniorial authority (*Grundherrschaft*) had been formed.

It is well known what comprehensive rights the lords of the land possessed in the period before the extinction of feudal and patrimonial powers, in the era of absolutism as well as in that of organization by estates of the realm: rights attaching to a particular property and rights dependent on the holder's position by birth; the power of a superior over his inferiors, often joined to a right of participation in the central government of the land.

It is not the purpose of this study to follow these relations in their development, in their individual variations and in their generally uniform progress. It is rather my purpose to throw light on a few phases of the relations of seigniorial authority toward the state in the earlier periods of German history—phases which have a bearing on much-discussed and fundamentally important questions: with the question of the origin of the town and of territorial sovereignty. For with the town problem and that of the growth of sovereignty is bound up the question whether seigniorial authority had a part in this development, and if so, in what measure; whether manorial law (*Hofrecht*), a species of law developed in the seigniorial estates, was the basis of municipal law; whether the methods employed by the larger seigniorial domains passed over into those of the administration of cities and of territories; in short what, if any, were the relations of the older organization of seigniorial authority to the institutions of town and territorial government; to those institutions which became the foundation of the whole devel-

¹ A paper read before the International Congress of Historical Sciences at Berlin, August 7, 1908, by Dr. Gerhard Seeliger, professor in the University of Leipzig.

opment of the later and present life of the Germans as a political community.

While on one side it is maintained that seigniorial authority is the true cradle of German territorialism, that out of it the German states were developed, and that it was *the* social power of the earlier Middle Ages, the other side flatly denies that it exercised any profound influence.

It is my intention, starting from facts that are recognized and in their essentials undisputed, to begin by sketching the development of the economic organism of seigniorial authority. I shall then describe its further development into a politically significant community, at the same time keeping the fundamental legal elements distinct from those of historical fact. By this method of approach it will become self-evident in what measure we may assume an influence of seigniorial authority upon the genesis of the town and of the sovereign state (*Landeshoheit*).

Among the ancient Germans each member of a community was allotted a definite share of land for his particular use. Freedom and the right to the use of the land went together; a man's political rights secured him a fixed standing in the agrarian organism; freedom, political rights and economic independence went hand in hand.

It was the institution of private ownership in land which brought about a separation. The result of private ownership is always a social and economic differentiation. The state no longer guaranteed its citizens a uniform economic basis; economic position was thenceforth dependent on the activity and success of the individual. There began to be active a potent individualistic principle, indispensable for all progress, and inevitably attended by important results, both social and political. The freeman who became economically dependent lost his full political independence, while whoever accumulated large property in land won increasing influence, and began to lord it over land and people.

The organization of the landed property which the churches and the lay grandees accumulated was patterned after the Roman system; not, indeed, the Roman system as it originally existed, but that system greatly modified by the addition of German elements, and in the course of historical development to a greater degree Germanized.

Characteristic of the system from the outset was the distinction between demesne land (*Salland*) and tenants' land. Only a small portion of a lord's estate was exploited by the lord himself or by his agent, the *villicus*, who was already known in Roman times; most of the land was in the hands of dependent people. Every-

where seigniorial powers became centralized; and manors (*Fronhöfe*) were established as centres of the seigniorial administration in different parts of the domain, which was sometimes widely scattered. Only occasionally was the estate of a landlord continuous, to the inclusion of whole marks; usually it was composed of numerous separate parcels, sometimes of small extent.

Around the manor stretched the land exploited by the proprietor, the *terra salica* or *indominicata*, and beyond it lay the tenants' land, the holders of which were bound to the manor for dues and services. If the creation of seigniorial property around individual manors was impossible or disadvantageous, the landlords as early as Frankish times contented themselves with the establishment of stations for the collection of rent in the different districts in which their rented land lay. To the manors belonged, however, not alone the tenants, who held land of the lord, but also a number, frequently considerable, of people who were dependents but held none of the lord's land, serfs and freemen who personally stood in a fixed hereditary relation of dependence to the manor, and were charged with the payment of a money rent or with a few days of manorial service during the year.

This is the peculiarity of the economic organization of the seigniorial authority and of its manors, that only a very small number of the people under the lord's authority entirely lacked economic independence, and as servants had to devote all their working power to their lord. The great mass of manorial dependents, the mass of those connected with the manor, although constrained to yield dues and service, yet possessed a certain, sometimes a very extensive, economic freedom, and, spite of continuing subjection, were able to work for themselves and to sell the product of their labor, to amass earnings and to raise themselves to a higher social and economic rank.

The industrial labor needed by the manorial economy was regulated in the same manner as the agricultural. There were industrial laborers who did not act as servants but, like the agricultural tenants, were free to work also for themselves and for the market. On the one hand they stood in a relation of fixed economic dependence to the manor; they were definitely bound, and yet were capable of economic advance.

An exceedingly complex gradation of economic obligations existed among the people of a seigniorial estate; from the serf, who must give all to his lord, to the wholly independent tenant, who owed a small yearly rent or perhaps a day's labor in the year, ran an unbroken series. But almost all, even those closely bound, possessed

the possibility of a free development of their economic powers; even the servant who rendered day-labor won in the course of development a certain economic independence.

It is indeed a momentous fact, important for the whole later development, that seigniorial authority did not seek to bind its subordinates on all sides; that it did not try to mould tenancy into absolute immobility and dependence; that instead it from the beginning left to the great mass of tenants their economic personality, considerable freedom of movement, and the power to accumulate property, not only within the seigniority but outside it; and especially that the class held only by slight personal bonds was given an opportunity to struggle entirely out of the sphere of seigniorial authority. Without regard to the old legal conditions and to the distinction between free and unfree, it built up its organization of labor, admitting freemen and even serfs from outside, and on the other hand allowing its own serfs outside service.

It is necessary for us to take all this into consideration if we are to understand subsequent institutions. The men charged with manorial obligations were thus from the outset fully qualified to take part in a free economic life, even in one that stood outside the bounds of manorial authority; to participate in market activities and urban economic life. Thus seigniorial authority permitted an ebb and flow of social forms, an issue of the predial population from its narrower circle. And thus it was made possible for seigniorial authority itself to act with its organization in the realm of political life and of civil administration, to ally itself with the factors of the state, to assume important public functions and to furnish the very foundation for the development of new and divergent state institutions.

From the beginning seigniorial authority not only bound its subordinates economically, but also sought to govern them politically. Naturally something of the strong patriarchal power of old Germanic days passed over to the later lords of the land. The free tenants, even, had come to a certain extent under the political authority of their landlords. As the state had recognized the authority of the head of the house, so it also recognized that of the later lord of the land. Separate political and judicial districts began to come into existence. Private affairs were settled at home, and not alone agrarian and property questions, but also other matters, civil and criminal. A seigniorial tribunal began to act, the manor court became a court of justice, and at the same time the

manor became the centre of an independent military organization; the foundations of a new communal life were laid.

But these new communities are not created merely by the power of private lordships. The forces which worked in them did not arise out of seigniorial authority alone. Even if a private lordship was able to create for itself an administrative and judicial district of its own, a tribunal of its own for the affairs of its own domain, an unlimited jurisdiction over the serfs of the manor, a limited jurisdiction over all to whom it owed protection; on the other hand there were early added rights conferred by royal grant. Immunities won for the seigniorial estate and seigniorial folk protection from the immediate interference of the royal officials. By the forbidding of these officials to set foot on immune territory or to have direct official dealings with persons protected by an immunity, they created an intermediate seigniorial jurisdiction and brought about the formation of seigniorial courts and military communities of their own. Finally the state recognized the seigniorial court as a court of general jurisdiction, granted it privileges and placed it on the same basis with the state courts, and thus admitted it into the organism of the institutions of the state. This came about in Carolingian times.

Thus did private lordship take into itself elements of state origin. Private and public authority became intermingled, and the whole stood in a position of unconditional subordination to the state, which at that time was vastly expanded, and which in its operation made no halt before private spheres of power. But even if the Carolingian state in its struggle for power in general forced the private authorities, especially those of the church, into its sphere, and made them a part of its organization, it did not render these powers permanently serviceable to itself, but strengthened the private authority. And when therefore in post-Carolingian times the actual dissolution of the bureaucratic state set in, when the powers of the provincial functionaries were treated as private usufruct rights, and were bequeathed, partitioned, sold and mortgaged, then the private authorities, being already equipped besides with elements of public power, were frequently able to combine with these powers those derived from the exercise of public functions in the provinces. And through this there came about not only an internal development and strengthening, but also a territorial rounding out of the lordship.

But not alone through this. Already during Frankish times, the natural endeavor of the lords was toward the territorial completion of their spheres of power. This was attempted in two ways: through the rounding out of the estates, whereby *eo ipso* the lord's

rights obtained a local completeness, and through the extension of the lord's authority over a definite district, without the acquisition of proprietorship in the land, by laying claim to an authority over all the inhabitants of the district, whether dwelling on manorial land or not, whether free or serf, similar to that which existed on an immune estate—to a mediatorship between the organs of the state and the population of the district—to a coercive power. This led to the establishment of *potestates* (a word met perhaps already in this sense since the seventh century) of *districtus*, and the like—of “ban-districts”, as the expression went in many parts of Germany from the tenth century on.

The institution of “lordship”, taking its rise from landholding on a large scale, progressed beyond the realm of landownership and extended over the whole of continuous districts, independently of the expansion of the landed property, those political rights which privileged landed property had acquired. This came to pass both with and without the authorization of the state, and in various ways; through voluntary submission of the inhabitants of a district to the lord's power, through the acquisition of privileges, through usurpation, through purchase. It came to pass also with most various results; for it happened frequently that a single lord acquired the *bannus* in the whole of a village; at other times in one portion only of the village, and sometimes even each landlord exercised the *bannus* in his property. The stable characteristic of this institution of ban-lordship is that rights over territory were established, which must be carefully distinguished from ownership; which neither consisted of property rights nor merely developed out of them.

The ban-lord, indeed, at once demands of his ban-folk submission and dues which often are a simple extension of those demanded of the tenant, and which bind the folk to the manor. And subsequently, especially in the later Middle Ages, the ban-lord frequently lays claim to a species of overlordship over all the land of the district, even demands services and rent from land which was not at all granted by him; and, through the widespread notion of the necessary existence of “lordships” over all open country, such claims were unresistingly recognized. Foundations, which held lands in the banlieue of another, even resigned themselves to this, for the sake of carrying out toward others a similar policy in their own banlieues.

The power of the lords differed in extent. Only the coercive authority was universal, while the jurisdiction bound up with it varied widely. Often only the low justice was won, often high justice, full justice, which effected the separation of the district from

connection with the county (*Grafschaft*), and secured for the districts of the new lordships a position exactly equal to that obtained by the older counties. Thenceforth such a "lordship" did not differ in kind from an acquired county, or portion of a county.

It is evident that, as regards the local exercise of the powers of the state, their distribution and organization, these ban-lordships always possessed a great importance. Such an importance the seigniorial authorities, the lords of the land as such, did not possess. They were not capable of it, from the nature of their authority, or from its territorial extent. Only the seigniorial authority that developed into ban-lordship could win this influence. If we analyze the real nature and the historical source of these "lordships", we perceive that most of their more important social functions did not originate in private lordship, and should not be considered legally as developments of the rights of private lordship; that they are rather an additional acquisition; that the real kernel of the seigniorial power was derived directly or indirectly from the state. But the whole organization of the "lordship" (*Herrschaft*) has nevertheless grown out of the organization of the seigniorial power; historically the whole structure of lordship appears as a gradual development out of the older system of seigniorial authority; the lordship shows itself always homogeneous in its power, exhibits no duality of origin, no distinction between public and private, recognizes only a single body of seigniorial functionaries, a single seigniorial organization. The manors (*Fronhöfe*) had developed courts whose jurisdiction included others than the predials of the manor (*i. e.*, *Dinghöfe*); they were the centre of the whole organization, the seat of the lord, the *burg*; and often as well the centre of a district and endowed with manifold public powers.

If we keep these facts before our eyes, we shall be able to answer the question as to the influence of seigniorial authority on the moulding of the public life, and on the rise of towns and of territories, in a way which surely does not attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable and to bring together things which do not belong together, but which accounts for and finds intelligible the sharp opposition of opinion, and thus endeavors to open the way for a common understanding.

Assuredly the *German town* did not grow out of those seigniorial institutions which concerned the practice of agriculture. Assuredly the lord who aimed at the foundation or the prosperity of a market centre, the inhabitants associated in other ways than those which united the rural population, did not demand agricultural services;

often indeed demanded no services at all, even relinquished dues, expecting to gain the material result in another way, through market tolls and the like, since the slightest possible ties and obligations on the part of individuals served most effectually the general economic prosperity of the seignior.

Still even the older urban community bears a seigniorial character. It is not to be supposed that originally a free community existed, which only later received a lord as lord of the community, in order still later to free themselves again. All the special rights which in the older days were granted by the king were always granted to a lord, never to a community. The free burgher community is a later institution, which sprang from the autonomy granted the inhabitants by the town lord, and from that co-operation and self-direction observable everywhere in Teutonic and Germanic community life. The law of the market settlement, municipal law, is built upon the legal basis of a lordship; the town of the olden time is a seigniorial institution. It is distinct from the rural-agricultural institutions of the seignior; it is established as a differing institution alongside of those which minister to seigniorial authority in the narrower sense. But the distinction was not made because the lord as proprietor exercised here public and there private prerogatives, for both prerogatives appear in both spheres, but because the difference in economic conditions demanded a different handling of the two spheres of lordship, the urban and the rural. And since the distinction is to be conceived as only the natural result of the differing economic requirements, we encounter no absolute and impossible separation of the two spheres of authority, and find almost universally a certain connection between the urban and the manorial administration of the lord. Thus not only were the seigniorial officials of the lord's court active in the city government, but burghers could owe service to the manor. We do not need the artificial explanation that the notices of payments made to the manor by burghers mean imperial taxes or dues to the lords of the community. Men liable to manorial service were not shut out from participation in urban life. If we consider as manorial law (*Hofrecht*) the law issuing from a manor, and regard as subject to manorial law all who in matters of tenure remained under the jurisdiction of the manorial court, then it is to be insisted upon that municipal law and manorial law were not in principle mutually exclusive.

Naturally it was customary for the city-lord to refer jurisdiction in those questions of tenure, which applied to his parcels of land within the civic bounds, to the seigniorial tribunal especially com-

petent in urban matters, the city court. But he could also take another course. When a civic settlement had its roots in an older agricultural one, the old bonds could still hold good, and the burghers, spite of municipal law and civic associations, remain legally bound to the manor. Or in a case where the lord of the town subsequently allowed the citizens to settle on his land, which at first he had left unencumbered by market settlement, he could erect a special seigniorial court, thoroughly in harmony with burgher existence and burgher law.

It must, however, be noted that even though it be unnecessary to distinguish fully and fundamentally between the domains of manorial and municipal law; even though we must admit the possibility of a mutual overlapping of these domains, this by no means should revive the notion that municipal law developed out of manorial law. That which created the special municipal law and the burgher community did not descend from manorial law. Those elements of seigniorial authority which had special sway in the life of the town could have sprung from the soil of private rights, just as little as from that of a communal power. They have, rather, their source in the royal authority, in the rights granted by the king. From this source came that out of which were born the special burgher and urban spheres of jurisdiction.

It is, then, conceivable that as a special sphere of lordship the town was founded and fostered alongside the older sphere of seigniorial authority. Influences of the older seigniorial organization are, indeed, not wholly wanting—it is impossible that they should be; but from the nature of the case this influence was unimportant.

Quite different were the relations to territorial sovereignty (*Landeshoheit*). It is indeed beyond doubt that the *power* of the sovereign lords was not of a seigniorial nature, and not to be conceived of as a development of seigniorial power; that it derives rather from governmental rights, possessed originally by the great Frankish local officials, especially the counts.

Surely it is correct, and it is generally recognized as deserving strong emphasis, that the vague and obscure notions of seigniorial authority as the cradle of state-building should be quite swept away, and that the true legal continuity should be clearly and sharply pointed out.

But the clearing up of the legal relationships does not suffice for the comprehension of historical phenomena. The notion that the power of territorial sovereignty legally had its origin in the state is undoubtedly correct, but it by no means fully explains the forces

potent in the establishment of states. It was long since recognized that the territories by no means always corresponded with the old official jurisdictions, the duchies, counties and hundreds; that much more frequently a correspondence appeared with institutions which originated in forces outside the state. Such observations led to the idea of the universally productive force of seigniorial authority in the formation of states.

To the question whether seigniorial authority exercised an influence we must answer as follows: Seigniorial authority in and of itself did not; its scattered position was enough to make that impossible. But where seigniorial authority developed into a compact ban-lordship, an influence was possible, and it was a very important influence from every point of view.

When ban-lordships had won wider public rights, jurisdiction over life and death and other powers, the sum of which led to sovereignty, when they had emancipated themselves from superior authority and shut out lower authority, they were able to become elements in state-building; adding themselves as new parts to more extensive states, or forming the beginnings of small independent states. Already in the tenth and eleventh centuries, not a few of what were later counties rose from such lordships, and not merely from the partitioning of the old *gau*-counties and the uniting of fragments of old counties.

Moreover the ban-lordships, even when the process of emancipation from a superior authority was not a success, and when they had acquired inferior jurisdiction only, played an important rôle in public life, as patrimonial lordships of various kinds in the states, or as administrative districts of the princely government. For it is especially to be noted that these lordships exercised no little influence even in the great territories which grew out of the highest local offices of the empire, the duchies and margraviates, and that they helped determine the local organization of the government of the country.

It follows, then, that the "lordship" influenced the development of state institutions in two ways. First in the distribution of the public power among the smaller districts, *i. e.*, during the building up of the states; next, in the organization of public functions within the states. In so far as these "lordships" grew out of the seigniorial organization—and this was really their source—the old seigniorial system lived on in state life and influenced the later institutions of the state. To make these connections clear, and to establish the degrees of influence in the different spheres, is a fascinating

and an important historical problem, and one as yet only partially solved.

A few closing words. In the early Middle Ages, the empire formed the German state. To be sure, it was a state quite unlike the state of later centuries and the state of to-day. To be sure, it was not so positively characterized as later by the conception of a political personality, the idea of a community complete in itself, and from its very nature, independent of kinds of government. To be sure, the notion of political lordship then attached itself chiefly to the person of the ruler, and therefore permitted and required a private administration of public powers, an alliance of the state with private lordship. It was not in the cities that first arose a conception of the community, of a commonwealth independent of the lordship of an individual. This already existed in the *Imperium* and the *Regnum*, and, though churchly influences may also have contributed to it, the basal idea of a political community self-established and independent of the individual relations of the ruler was already operative. It was for this reason that the state was never fully broken up into the dominions of private lords. In this sense Germany was never fully feudalized; the separate character of the more important rights derived from the state continued intact, in spite of all private administration; always there remained an association of political functions with the empire, not alone in affairs of high justice through grant of criminal jurisdiction, but also through the superintendence of the king, through occasional putting aside of the royal authority, through effective consciousness that the king was the real source of all political powers. King and empire remained living central powers.

But alongside of the state are at work other possessors of political functions which we are wont to look on as belonging to the state; especially (I omit all mention of the church) *private lordships* and corporations, notably *communities*. It is characteristic of the earlier periods of German history that alongside the state and its organs or deputies, private lordships, too, and corporations (communities) were independently active in the life of society. The reciprocal relation was unsettled, the functions were fluctuating, but they existed as historical forces. And the powers of the three combined in manifold ways; fragments of authority cut away from the empire, functions previously attached to some office, were joined with private powers, private lordships with functions that originated with the commune, and the like.

Combinations of this sort appear also in the building up of new

institutions, which begot a more intensive politico-social life; in the formation of territories and towns. It is surely an important historical problem in what ways *the state*, *private lordship* and the *commune* shared in laying the foundations of the new order and in its development. It is in general quite possible to determine, what has its origin in the state, what in private lordship, especially in seigniorial authority, and what in the early communes; how the old allies itself with the new and begets the new. At any rate, this much is wholly clear: all the essential elements which came to development in the states and the cities, and which lay at the root of new political institutions, originated in the ancient state, in the empire. They are the powers of the empire transferred or carried over to local spheres. That is an assured foundation of research, and should be adhered to in the face of many other opinions. Not from a private, and not from a separate corporate or communal power, do the elements derive which, fostered in towns and territories, have opened the way to a more intensive social life. They have their origin in the empire, in the early state. Elements of the old state have created the bases of the new. These are well-established sequences in the history of law and authority.

But just as the old ideas of corporation and community won a real influence in the German town, although the distinct legal organization of the town did not spring from the soil of a distinct communal power, so the private lordships, the seigniorial authority, exercised an influence on the development of the territories. Seigniorial authority, especially when developed into ban-lordship, was often able to furnish the outer framework for the new territorial institutions or for the administrative circumscriptions within the states; its own organization lived on in the later institutions of the several states. That is its not inconsiderable part in the foundation of the new public powers in Germany.

GERHARD SEELIGER.

THE ORIGIN AND CREDIBILITY OF THE ICELANDIC SAGA¹

THERE is probably no literary production of the Middle Ages which makes such an impression upon the modern reader as the Icelandic saga. It is true that the saga breathes the cooling breath of times long since gone by, that it tells of people whose thoughts and whose conceptions of honor and of duty differed from ours. The art of the saga, however, is modern, realistic. Its men and women stand before us as if in flesh and blood, as they love and hate, as they live and die. We hear the words they utter, curt, blunt, sharp as a sword, full of pithy humor. We are carried away by the dramatic action.

The saga presents no analysis of conditions of soul, contains no moralizing observations; it is sober and realistic. Conciseness of style and composition is its chief characteristic. The unimportant is never carried into detail—is often barely touched upon. Here the saga fundamentally differs in effect from the moralizing and wordy prose of medieval Latin. What a difference between Snorre and the Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus, even when both are recounting the same story!

The style of the saga is marked by art and in part even by a very refined art. It has been formed through oral recitation: art has developed nature. The speech of the ancient Norsemen was in fact similar to the language of the saga. *Gens breviloqua et veridica*, the Icelanders are called by Giraldus Cambrensis. In 1170 Dublin, until then the capital of a northern Viking kingdom, was sacked by the English. The king, Haskulf, took flight, but later returned with a fleet. After an heroic encounter he was captured and was asked whether he wished to be ransomed. He answered proudly: "We came this time with a small company and have just made a beginning. If my life is spared we shall soon come with another and much greater host." After this speech he was beheaded.

The sagas contain, however, many lifeless passages, for instance, the long and detailed genealogies. It is true that genealogies played

¹A paper read (in German) at the International Congress of the Historical Sciences at Berlin, August, 1908, by Professor Alexander Bugge of the University of Christiania.

an important part in old Icelandic life, and that every chieftain had to know the names of his ancestors. It is therefore possible that even in the orally narrated sagas genealogies did occur. But the learned saga-writers have, no doubt, further developed this habit, perhaps through the influence of the Biblical genealogies. Even in the best sagas, as for instance, the *Njála*, the great number of personages and the various parallel lines of action become almost oppressive. This is accounted for by the fact that several originally independent short narratives are blended into a single whole.

But how, where and when did the saga have its origin? All the northern people were accustomed to tell stories (*sagen*).² We find the same Viking stories told by English and Norman, as well as by Russian historians, as for example, the story of the city which was set afire by sparrows, with nut-shells bound under their wings. The Varangians in Russia had perhaps an incipient oral saga-narrative, as we may conclude from Nestor's chronicle. The Grand Duke Oleg³ sailed in the year 907 towards Constantinople and came to the Sound,⁴ as Nestor, using a Norse loan-word, calls the Bosphorus. The emperor was forced to conclude peace. Oleg said: "Sew sails of silk for the Russians and sails of linen for the Slavs!" He fastened his shield as a token of victory upon the city-gate and sailed away. The Russians spread their silken sails, the Slavs their linen ones. The wind rent the former and the Slavs said: "Let us keep our sail-cloth; silk sails are not suitable for Slavs."

The Swedish runic inscription of Rök (of the ninth century), which may be called a library in stone, mentions not only ancient songs but also stories, which appear to have had an unmistakable similarity with the legendary hero-saga, the *fornaldarsaga*. The saga of the Viking chief, mentioned on many Swedish rune-stones, Ingvarr Viðförlir, who lived in the first half of the eleventh century, is declared in the saga itself to have been heard by an Icelandic merchant at the court of the king of Sweden and by him brought to Iceland. It may be, therefore, that the Swedes knew sagas orally narrated; written sagas, however, they did not have. The *Guta Saga* (History of the Gotlanders), composed about 1300, on the island of Gotland, stands quite alone but has the same characteristics as the Icelandic saga, with little verses interspersed. Perhaps, however, the *Guta Saga* had its origin under foreign influences.

² I need not emphasize here the difference between *saga* and *sage*. [In this translation the word *story* has been used for *sage*.]

³ Oleg, *i. e.*, Old Norse Helgi.

⁴ The word *Sund* is used only two or three times by Nestor and always in cases where he is treating expeditions of the Swedish conquerors of Russia (the "Russ") to Byzantium.

The Gotlanders indeed were, as merchants, acquainted with all northern and western Europe. In Denmark hardly as much advancement was made as in Sweden.

The saga belongs to the Norwegian and to the Icelandic people. Stories and legends have been narrated among the Norsemen since the earliest times. The Icelandic *Landnámabók* (the Book of the Settling of Iceland) contains stories which must date from the first period of Iceland's settlement.⁵ Even in very early times different stories were often loosely joined together. Seamen who sailed along the coast of Norway contributed much toward spreading these stories and connecting them together.⁶ Similar stories live on until this day in the Norwegian valleys, especially in the secluded Sætersdalen (in southern Norway).⁷ They are dramatic, are frequently told with genuine art and even contain scattered bits of verse. A real saga, however, has never been created in the Norwegian valleys.

We learn how stories of that kind originate, from the *Fóstbræðrasaga* (Saga of the Foster-brothers). The poet Þormóðr is lying at midday alone in a booth at the assembly of the Greenlanders. Someone comes and says: "You are losing great pleasure. I was at the booth of Þorgrímr Einarsson. He was relating a saga. The men are sitting around him and listening." Þormóðr asks: "Can you give me the name of any person in the narrative?" The other answers: "Þorgeirr was a great hero in the story. Þorgrímr also had something to do with it. He defended himself manfully as might be expected." Þormóðr understands that Þorgrímr is relating how he killed Þormóðr's foster-brother. He takes his axe, slays the narrator and makes his escape. This narrative is indeed called a saga, but this word in Icelandic signifies any kind of narrative. That related by Þorgrímr Einarsson was not yet a real saga. Even where several stories are joined together we have as yet no saga. There is still lacking that which makes the individual narratives into the artistically completed whole which we call a saga.

The *märchen* and not the story (*sage*) is the mother of the saga. The style, the humor of the saga is borrowed from the *märchen*. The story (*sage*) treats only a single episode in the life of the hero.

⁵ E. g., the story of Hjørleifr who was killed by his Irish slaves. The latter to preserve their own lives knead meal and butter together and call it *minnþak*, a genuine Irish word occurring with the same meaning in the *Lex Adamnani*. Iceland was found by Norwegians about the years 860-870, and was settled from Norway during the next fifty or sixty years.

⁶ Cf. Axel Olrik, *Kilderne til Saxos Historie*, II. 280 ff., and *Landnámabók* (*Islendinga Sögur*, I. 326), where a Norwegian merchant, sailing on a ship along the western coast of Norway, tells the story of King Vatnar and his grave-mound.

⁷ The stories of Sætersdalen have been collected by Johannes Skar, *Gamalt or Sætesdal*, I-III.

The fairy-tale (*märchen*) and the saga, however, narrate the whole life of the hero in a series of episodes. The *märchen* is dramatic; its language is curt and blunt, just like the saga. All *märchen* and all sagas resemble each other, without being all equally well narrated. *Märchen* have been told by the Norwegians from the time that they settled in the Scandinavian peninsula. The saga narrators could likewise recount *märchen*. The sagas related at an Icelandic wedding in 1117 were regarded as *märchen* by the contemporaries; they were fictitious sagas, so-called *lýgi-sögur*. Odd the Monk, the oldest biographer of Olaf Tryggvason, says in the introduction to his work, "It is better to hear this than the step-mother tales the herdsmen tell." The word *soga* means in Norwegian dialects not only narrative but likewise *märchen*.

Many sagas, especially those parts of them which treat of the hero's youth, are entirely or partially built upon *märchen*. The tale of the later Faroese chief Sigmundr Brestason, who comes as a boy to a lonely Norwegian farm, and is hidden by the wife when the farmer comes home and smells the stranger, is nothing but the *märchen* of the Boy at the Giant's Court. The *märchen* of Aschenbrödel, who lies idle by the fire, but suddenly rises, bathes, combs and trims his hair, seizes weapons, becomes a great warrior, and finally gains the kingdom and the princess, was a story in great favor with the old Norwegians and Icelanders. Sagas like the *Svarfdælasaga* and the early history of Harald the Fairhaired, who unified Norway, are to a great extent built upon this tale.

The account, as told by Odd the Monk, of the childhood of the Norwegian chief Olaf Tryggvason (d. 1000), who with his mother had to flee from the evil queen Gunhild, is nothing but an ordinary *märchen*-motive. Olaf, like the heroes of the *märchen*, comes among strangers early in life. His royal descent is discovered by a miracle. Sorcerers had prophesied that a young man had come to Russia, from whose *hamingja* (guardian spirit) a light would spread over the whole of eastern Europe. The wise queen of Novgorod hears of this and the king on her prayer calls together a general assembly. On the third day the queen comes upon a young boy in ragged clothing, his hat pulled down over his eyes. She looks into his eyes and sees that he is the right one. Olaf is brought to the king and his royal origin is made known. This story is composed after the *märchen* of the Youth with the Golden Hair, who hides his hair under a big hat, feigning to be unclean. The light over Olaf's *hamingja* and the general assembly originate in another *märchen*. In Brittany the story runs thus: Rome is without a pope. For three days a procession goes through the country

with burning candles. On the third day a guileless boy, Innocent, joins the procession, holding a willow rod. The birds in a willow tree have prophesied to him his future greatness. A flame kindles itself on the point of the rod. Innocent is made pope. In another version of the story, the light kindles on the young man's head.⁸

The earliest sagas now known were written down in the second half of the twelfth century and in the course of the thirteenth, and those recording the lives of the Norwegian kings, especially of Olaf Tryggvason and of St. Olaf, were probably written down before the family sagas. The oral saga, the saga that was only narrated, and not written down, is however much older. Already at the above-mentioned wedding in 1117, sagas were narrated.⁹ The Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus (twelfth century) knew a number of hero-sagas (*fornaldarsögur*) of Norwegian or Icelandic origin. In the second half of the eleventh century we meet with a succession of Icelanders who bear the honorary epithet *fróði*, that is, "learned in sagas, or in history". Many of these were the authorities for Ari Fróði and the *Landnámabók*. These "antiquaries" were similar to the Irish *senchaidi*. Besides the saga-men there were also in Iceland professional scalds just as in Ireland there were *filed* or scalds, besides *senchaidi* or "antiquaries".

Earlier, however, than in Norway or Iceland the saga developed in the Viking settlements on the British Isles. The first saga to arise concerning a Norwegian king was the Saga of Olaf Tryggvason, who fell in the year 1000. Its basis is old tradition and not, as in the case of the lives of his predecessors, as they are found in Snorre's *Heimskringla*, contemporaneous scaldic poems used by learned saga-men in writing the histories. A saga of Olaf Tryggvason, however, was narrated in the eleventh century, not only in Norway but also in England. Olaf came thither in 991, as leader of the Vikings, compelled the English for the first time to pay "danegeld", was baptized and concluded peace with King Æthelred. Odd the Monk, who lived in the second half of the twelfth century, mentions a saga of King Olaf narrated in England about 1060. His authority was a native of the Orkney Islands.¹⁰ In Britain Olaf

⁸ My colleague, Professor Moltke Moe, who has had the kindness to go over this lecture with me and whose extraordinary knowledge has been of great advantage to me, has called my attention to this *märchen* of the Bird of Good Luck, originating from Byzantium. Cf. the exposition of Professor Moe in Helland, *Norges Land og Folk, Finnmarkens Amt*, II. 397-403, explaining the Finnish fairy-tale of the Bird of Luck.

⁹ I do not here mention the historian Ari Fróði (1067-1148), the father of Icelandic history, whose work (*Islendingabók* or *Libellus Islandorum*) bears a closer resemblance to annalistic writings than to the sagas.

¹⁰ This authority is not mentioned by Odd himself, but only in the *Flateyjarbók* and in the great Olaf's saga, but the tradition goes back to Odd.

Tryggvason was confounded with another Olaf, the famous Viking chieftain and king of Northumberland who is known by the Celtic surname Cuarán (Shoe). This Olaf, who fought at Brunanburh in 937, and afterwards became king of Dublin and died as a pilgrim on the sacred island of Iona in 981, is commonly regarded as the prototype of the hero of the famous medieval tale of Havelok the Dane. But the story of Olaf Cuarán does not coincide with that of Havelok. The saga of Havelok, known in French as well as in English versions, is the story of Olaf Tryggvason, only remodelled into the form of a *märchen*. The tale of Havelok sprang from the British saga of Olaf in Norman times. Olaf Tryggvason is frequently called Havelok in the Middle English rhyming chronicles.¹¹ The real Olaf Cuarán, in the same chronicle which contains the saga of Havelok (in Gaimar), is called, not Havelok, but Anlaf Cuiran. The only time that the name Cuarán appears in an Irish chronicle (the *Leabhar Oiris*), it is used for a warrior who fought in the battle of Clontarf (1014).

Arthur conquers Denmark. Havelok's father, Gunter, king of that country, loses his life by treachery. The traitor Odulf is made an under-king under Arthur. The faithful Grim flees with the young Havelok and his mother. They are assailed by pirates. The mother is slain. Grim lands in eastern England. Around his hut a town rises, which is called after him, Grimsby. When Havelok grows up, his foster-parents are no longer able to keep him. He comes to King Edelsi of Lincoln, becomes a kitchen-boy and helps to carry water and wood. Edelsi has a niece, Argentele, daughter of the late king of Norfolk. He marries her to Havelok to disinherit her. The first night after they are married, Argentele dreams that the wild beasts of the forest pay homage to her husband and she sees a flame of fire coming from his mouth. She tells a pious hermit of this. He prophesies that Havelok will become king. Havelok learns of his royal descent and sails with his wife to Denmark. One of his father's faithful servants recognizes him by the flame, the traitor Odulf is killed and Havelok is made king. Later, at his wife's entreaty, he returns to England. In the English poem his army is represented as a foreign Viking host which slays priests and burns churches. King Edelsi is forced to surrender Norfolk and soon thereafter dies. Argentele and Havelok inherit Lincoln and live in splendor and happiness.

King Tryggve, the father of Olaf Tryggvason, was likewise slain through treachery. The traitor Hakon, jarl of Lade, who in the saga, incited by Queen Gunhild, persecutes Olaf and his mother

¹¹ Cf. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*.

Astrid, became an under-king under the king of Denmark, Harald Gormsson, who conquered Norway. Astrid, the widow of Tryggve, accompanied by a faithful servant, flees with her son to Russia. On the way they are seized by pirates; mother and son are separated. How Olaf's royal descent was discovered in Novgorod, we have already heard.

The light of Olaf's *hamingja* corresponds to the flame from Havelok's mouth. Olaf marries a Wendish, and afterwards an Irish and a Danish princess. These and the Russian queen are blended in Argentele. Later Olaf goes to England. In the Scilly Isles he visits a pious hermit who prophesies that he will be a king. He comes to Norway, the traitor Jarl Hakon is slain and he himself is made king.¹²

The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill is the name of an Irish work of the end of the eleventh century, telling of the wars between the Vikings and the Irish, and especially of the king of Munster, Brian Borumha, and the great battle of Clontarf in 1014.¹³ Among the sources for the history of this battle, the "historians of the Northlanders" (*senchaidi Gall*), are mentioned. My father, the late Sophus Bugge, has shown that a saga of King Brian and the battle of Clontarf was told orally by the Norsemen of Dublin in their own language, and perhaps even written down.¹⁴

This "Viking saga" has many features characteristic of the Icelandic saga. A peculiarity which we only meet in the saga of the Battle of Clontarf and in that of the Battle of Svolder (A. D. 1000), as well as in the story of the Battle of Braavalla, which has been modelled after the two above-mentioned tales, is that the names of the combatants are arranged in alliterative lines. The Icelandic saga grew up under the influence of the Viking saga and through this it is influenced also by the Celtic prose-narrative. In Ireland as in Wales heroic tales had from primitive times the form of prose narrative, while with the Germanic people their form was that of the poem. The Irish moreover had historical sagas; indeed the saga-narrators could even produce their own experiences in artistic prose. The poet Erard MacCoisi (at the end of the tenth century) comes disguised to the court of King Domnall, whose people had burned

¹² I discuss the entire question of the origin of the Havelok saga more fully in an article to be printed in the *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed*.

¹³ *The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill* (*Logadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh*), ed. by Todd, *Rerum Brit. Medii Aevi Scriptores* (London, 1867), cannot possibly, as Todd, the editor, thought, have been written immediately after the battle of Clontarf. The chronicle contains too many untruths, and *märchen* play too prominent a part in it. It was probably written at the end of the eleventh century.

¹⁴ S. Bugge, *Norsk Sagafortælling og Sagaskrivning i Irland* (published by the *Norsk Historisk Tidsskrift*).

his possessions and carried away his cattle. The king asks him what tales he has in his memory. The poet names one hundred and forty-nine different titles. He finally, by the only one which is unknown to the king, awakens the latter's curiosity. MacCoisi was concealing under this title the story of the injustice which had befallen him. All the narratives named by him had the form of prose, occasionally interspersed with verses, and should be called sagas.¹⁵

The Irish saga is a child of the country and of the people among whom it grew up. The continually changing tones and varied colors of the sky, the dark forests with their luxuriant underbrush, the blooming hedges of red thorn, white thorn, privet and fuchsia, which grows in southern Ireland to large trees; the still forest lakes in whose blackish-brown waters the beech-trees and the larches are reflected; the heather which clothes in pink the hillsides—all these give to nature in Ireland a peculiar, dreamy, even fanciful imprint, as in no other country of Europe. Like nature so the Irish people, a thousand years ago, were dreamy and fanciful, but at the same time wild and excitable, having the traits of a nature-people and yet also such as suggest the highest intellectual culture. The Irish hero-saga is wild and unrestrained, often tragic and deeply impressive, sometimes melancholy or elegiac; full of the finest nature-poetry. The tragic tale of the sons of Usnech or the tale of Ronan who murders his son (Fingal Ronain), is sure to move the reader with its wild pathos, as will the story of the children of Lir with its deep melancholy.

On the great inhospitable island covered with mountains and with ice, and in the midst of the ocean, there was no place for fancy or for dreamy melancholy. There people in the struggle for life grew to be cool men of sense, maintaining their rights and never allowing themselves to be carried away by their feelings. Like the people, so the Icelandic saga too is calm, exact and under control, its language clear and concise. The language of the Irish saga, on the contrary, is often diffuse and obscure (though not in the best specimens), and artistic moderation is foreign to it. Yet there is after all an unmistakable similarity between the Irish and the Icelandic saga. Both have a foothold in history; both begin by giving the hero's ancestry and early life, and verses are introduced in both to serve as historical proofs.

The Viking saga has left a lasting impress upon the Irish saga. Middle Irish prose literature is full of Scandinavian loan-words.

¹⁵ This story is found in the *Book of Leinster* (twelfth century) and is published by H. Zimmer in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*.

The above-mentioned work, *The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, at its beginning, where the early life of Brian is told, appears like an Irish chronicle of the usual type. With the story of the battle of Clontarf, the work assumes a completely altered character. The chronicle becomes a saga. The dramatic episodes however are borrowed from the Norse saga of Brian, as it was told in Dublin.

To indicate the Irish influence upon the Viking saga, and thereby upon the Icelandic saga, is not easy. The prose narrative as a species of artistic composition was primitive among the Irish, but not among the Norwegians. The Irish saga opened the eyes of the Norsemen, and, so to speak, set free the saga. Certain types and motives moreover are of Irish origin. The gallery of women in Celtic poetry is a remarkably rich one. Even Shakespeare has his Lady Macbeth and Cordelia of Celtic extraction. In the Icelandic saga, on the other hand, the men are more interesting. The most characteristic women are those who know no difference between good and evil, who attract men irresistibly by their unfading beauty, who by their vain and unbounded passion for revenge bring death and destruction upon friends as well as foes, but who themselves unharmed live on to a great age. To this type belong Hallgerd of *Njal's Saga* and Gudrun of the *Laxdæla*. They are related to the Brynhild of the Eddic songs. Their prototype, however, is the Irish queen Gormflaith,¹⁶ whose deadly hatred toward her former husband, Brian, brings on the battle of Clontarf, where, to win her, kings and chieftains lose their lives. Gormflaith or Kormlød was well known in Iceland. The *Njála*, whose heroine Hallgerd is, gives an excellent characterization of her. Other female figures of the Icelandic saga likewise appear to be influenced by the women of Irish poetry; for example, the fair Helga, the beloved of Gunnlaug Snake-tongue, bears unmistakable likeness to Derdriu, the loved one of Noisi, son of Usnech.

Of the men in the sagas, only the scalds resemble the Irish type. In their veins indeed there was often Celtic blood. The scald Kormak, for instance, the Icelandic Catullus, has an Irish name; his eyes are dark, his hair black and curled, his wit and his hot-blooded nature remind one more of the Celt than of the Scandinavian. The saga of the scald whose poems possess magic power¹⁷ is borrowed from Irish literature. The Icelander Þorleifr desires to take vengeance on Hakon, the mighty jarl of Lade.¹⁸ He comes

¹⁶ Queen Gormflaith was married three times: (1) to Maelsechlainn, king of Tara and supreme king of all Ireland, (2) to Olaf Cuarán, king of Dublin, by whom she had a son, Sitric, king of Dublin, (3) to Brian Borumha.

¹⁷ The *Þattr* of Þorleifr Jarlaskald, a continuation of the *Svarfdælasaga*.

¹⁸ Hakon ruled Norway from 965 to 995. His ancestors were hereditary earls of the northern part of the country.

to the latter's hall in disguise and recites a poem called *Þokuvísur* or "mist-song". The hall becomes dark in consequence; weapons move of themselves, and kill many men; the jarl falls sick, his beard and hair drop off. The Irish have always believed in the power of the satirical poem. Through this came "storms of every darkness", as is said in "The Colloquy of the Two Sages".¹⁹ The poet Athirne composed satirical poems against the inhabitants of Leinster so that neither grain nor grass nor leaves would grow.

In certain other episodes Irish influence can likewise be traced. A favorite motive in the sagas is the so-called *mannjafnaðr* (comparison between men). Most famous is the colloquy between the two kings of Norway, Eystein and Sigurd the Jerusalem-farer (ca. 1120), where each of the kings puts forth his claims to fame and declares what good he has done. This colloquy is not history but fiction, and formed under influence from Ireland, where similar comparisons play a great part in the heroic tales. In the *Ljósvetningasaga* there is a contention about precedence between two women that reminds the reader of the famous Irish tale "The Festival of Bríceriu". Adam of Bremen relates that Olaf Trygvason undertook at his wife's request the expedition in which he fell at Svolder in the year 1000. This episode has been recast by Snorre into a dramatic scene which is borrowed from Brian's saga. King Olaf comes one day with a present for his wife. She pushes it aside, however, and reproaches her husband severely as not daring to march through the realm of her brother, the king of Denmark, while her own father had conquered Norway. Olaf replies in anger: "I shall never be afraid of your brother. In case we meet he will get the worst of it!" He collects a fleet, sails through Öresund and falls at Svolder.

The battle of Clontarf is brought on by a similar episode. The king of Leinster, Maelmordha, comes to pay tribute to Brian. His sister Gormflaith has separated from Brian but is still living at his court. Maelmordha asks her to sew a silver button on his coat. She however throws the cloak into the fire and harshly reproaches her brother for being willing to pay a tax which neither his father nor his grandfather have given. Incited by his sister, Maelmordha severs relations with Brian, collects the latter's enemies and falls at Clontarf. It is only through such scenes that it is possible to indicate the force of Irish influence.²⁰

¹⁹ *Immacallam in dá Thuarad*, ed. by Whitley Stokes in the *Revue Celtique*, 1907.

²⁰ One of the most important Norwegian literary works of the Middle Ages is the so-called "Kings' Mirror" (*Speculum Regale* or *Konungs skuggsjá*). In

In the Norse settlements on the British Isles the saga-narrative flourished universally in the eleventh century, notably at the king's court in Dublin, where Irish and Norse scalds recited their elaborated poems.²¹ In the twelfth century sagas were still narrated in Dublin, for instance, that of the Norwegian king Magnus Barefoot, who fell in 1103 in Ulster and who is so prominent in Irish saga tradition.²² Is it too much to assume that people had also an oral saga-tale concerning the heroic death of the last king of Dublin and his companion, John the Furious, who clove a Norman knight in two with a single sword-stroke? Cumberland, where a mixed Norwegian-Cymric civilization developed²³ and where Norse runic inscriptions from the middle of the twelfth century have been found, is the home of the Havelok saga. The Viking saga of the Danish king Rolf Kraki and his heroes grew up in Northumberland or Lincolnshire out of old hero-songs, under the influence of the paladins of Charlemagne and Arthur. One of the heroes of King Rolf, the Norwegian, Boðvar Biarki, the Bear's Son, is mentioned in several writings from eastern England, and in them reference particularly is made to *fabulae Danorum* (Norse tales).²⁴ Geoffrey of Monmouth has made one of the paladins of Arthur out of this Boðvar (Beduerus, Bedivere).

The Viking saga exercised enduring influence upon the English literature of the Middle Ages. Geoffroy of Monmouth, whose *Historia Regum Britanniae* is full of Viking stories, knew for example the above-mentioned saga of Brian. Brennius wishes to shake off the authority of his brother, Belinus, and sues for the hand of a daughter of the king of Norway. With the princess and a great host of Norwegians he returns to Britain. They are attacked on the way by the Danish king Guichtlacus, whom the Norwegian princess has long loved. A violent storm comes on, the fleets are scattered, and Guichtlacus lands with his beloved in Northumberland. This tale has been compared with the story of Helgi and his one of its parts it narrates the wonders of Ireland. Dr. Kuno Meyer has recently shown (*Ériu*, 1908) that these stories about Ireland are not founded upon written sources, but upon oral narratives. This proves that stories and tales during the early Middle Ages really migrated from Ireland and Norway.

²¹ Of Icelandic scalds at the king's court in Dublin, I name only Gunnlaug Snake-tongue and Þorsteinn Orraskald, the court poet of Olaf Cuarán. Irish tales, e. g., of the poet Ruman, tell of Irish scalds who appeared in Dublin.

²² In several Ossianic hero-songs as well as in Irish and Gaelic stories, King Magnus plays an important part. The sea is still called *bothar Manuis*, the road of Magnus. Among the Ostmen of Ireland the Norse language was still spoken at the middle of the thirteenth century.

²³ Cf. the famous cross of Gorphoth, with carvings from the Norse mythology.

²⁴ See the narrative of the Anglo-Saxon national hero Hereward, in which several Norse scenes appear (cf. Deutschbein). Axel Olrik calls attention to another Northumbrian saga, that of Earl Siward the Fat.

love Sigrun in the Eddic songs,²⁵ and the Helgi saga in turn is conjectured to have been influenced by the saga of Brian.²⁶ The armies of Brennius and Belinus meet in the wood near Calaterium and fierce is the conflict. "The ranks fell like oats under the reaper's hand", says Geoffrey.²⁷ The Norwegians take flight to their ships; Belinus makes his escape to Gaul. There exists, however, no seaport Calaterium. The whole story is modelled on the narrative of the Battle of Clontarf. Here, too, the battle was fought in a forest outside of Dublin. The Irish saga relates that the "ranks fell as when a great host are reaping a field of oats". At the close of the day the Norwegians fled to their ships. The Irish tale at this point shows its origin from the Norse saga of Brian, for it is said to have been the spectators on the walls of Dublin who made this remark.

The Icelanders became acquainted with the Viking saga in part directly, through their relations with Ireland, and in part indirectly, by way of the Orkney Islands. There was rich literary activity on the Orkneys in the twelfth century. The most noted name about the middle of the century was Jarl Rognvaldr Kali, and about 1200, Bishop Biarni Kolbeinsson. Not poetry alone, but the saga flourished here. According to the view of several scholars Bishop Biarni was the author of the saga of the jarls of Orkney (*Jarlasaga*). At any rate, the life of St. Magnus, the Orkney jarl, was written there. It was through a man from the Orkney Islands, as we intimated above, that the Icelanders came to know the British saga of Olaf Trygvason.

Narrative tales had been related in Iceland since the time of its settlement, but now came knowledge of the saga on the British Isles—like a mental emancipation. Christianity was introduced; the times were more peaceful. Great deeds were now no longer done; men simply told about them. Legal proceedings had come instead of feuds. In such a period the saga could have its rise.

Richard Heinzel, who was the first to attempt a scientific investigation of the spirit of the saga, calls the sagas "historical romances". Finnur Jonsson (in his history of Icelandic literature) constantly emphasizes their historical value. They are, however, neither romances nor histories, but, as the name indicates, *sögur* (narrations), artistic reproductions of tradition. The historical and unhistorical are indissolubly blended. Some sagas are more, and some less, historical. A saga like that of Gunnlaug Snakes-

²⁵ Deutschbein.

²⁶ Sophus Bugge, *Helgedigtene*.

²⁷ Lib. III., c. 3.

tongue, because of its unified structure, stands very close to the historical romance. What the sagas tell of the Norwegian ancestors of their heroes is, as a rule, unhistorical. Where the action takes place in foreign lands it is generally an invention. Dress and weapons in the sagas belong to the end of the twelfth century. Sigurðr Sýr, when he receives his stepson, St. Olaf, is dressed as a knight of the time of Snorre. The chieftain Arinbjorn presents to the poet Egil Skallagrimsson a complete suit of English cloth and gives him long, elaborate silk sleeves to be fastened to the coat with golden buttons, and this about the year 950 when no English cloth-industry existed. Egil expresses his thanks for these sleeves, in a verse. This fashion, as Alwin Schultz²⁸ explains, was not introduced before the second half of the eleventh century.

Where a saga is fiction we find the epic laws established by Axel Olrik²⁹ prevailing. For instance, the "law of the number three" applies. On the third day the queen of Novgorod finds Olaf Tryggvason; the Hallgerd of the *Njála* is thrice married and receives a blow on the cheek from each of her three husbands. In these laws we possess an excellent method of deciding whether or not, and in what parts, a saga is the result of poetic invention.

Oral saga-narration originated between 950 and 1000 in the Viking settlements on the British Isles. During the next fifty years these sagas became known in Iceland as well as in Norway. Then the Icelanders in the second half of the eleventh century began to collect the oral traditions. The oral saga had its rise during this time in Iceland, to be written down eighty or a hundred years later.

Peculiar conditions are responsible for the creation of the art of the Icelandic saga: the peaceful life on that distant island in the midst of the ocean, far from the happenings which alter the course of history; remembrance of the forefathers who fought in Britain and Ireland and who were great chieftains in Norway; the duty of the chieftain to know his ancestral lineage; the relatively great prosperity still prevailing after Viking times, but subsequently offset by economic distress; the long winter evenings in the chieftain's hall or the light summer nights at the Althing.

Three times has the poetry of the Norwegian-Icelandic race conquered the world: by means of the Eddic songs, the Icelandic sagas, and the writings of Ibsen and Björnson. Between these lead paths which the investigator must follow.

ALEXANDER BUGGE.

²⁸ *Höfisches Leben zur Zeit der Minnesänger.*

²⁹ On the Epic Laws Dr. Axel Olrik gave a lecture at the Historical Congress of Berlin.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE DUTCH QUESTION IN 1787-1788

THE first great event of an international character which confronted the younger Pitt in his ministry was the Dutch Question. It would take us too far back to describe the origins of the disputes between the hereditary Stadholder and the States of some of the provinces of the Dutch Netherlands. They were complicated by the questions at issue between the provinces and the States General, representing the United Provinces. It must suffice to say that the federal constitution was settled by the compact arrived at in 1747, whereby the stadholderate (which had been suppressed in 1702) was restored as a perpetual office, hereditary in the House of Orange. The relations between the provinces were also adjusted; but neither these nor the powers of the Stadholder were defined with sufficient clearness to avert disputes in the future. The constitution of 1747 was confirmed in 1766. Nevertheless the troubles which followed, especially the war with England in 1780-1783, brought the whole question to a climax in the succeeding years.

The difficulties resulting from a loose federal tie, and the different constitutions and customs of the component provinces, concerning which the Dutch themselves were generally ill informed,¹ increased owing to the incompetence of the Stadholder, William V. The grandson of George II. of England, trained by his mother the Princess Anne to love and admire her country, he early ruffled the feelings of his subjects. During his minority he was under the tutelage of the Duke Louis of Brunswick, who made some encroachments on the military prerogatives of the provinces. Even when

¹ See Grenville's letter of July 31, 1787, to Pitt from the Hague, in *The Dropmore Papers*, III. 410.

For the Dutch disputes see Jacobi, *Geschichte der Siebenjährigen Verwirrungen . . . in den Vereinigten Niederlanden*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1789); Schloezer, *Ludwig Ernst, Herzog zu Braunschweig und Lüneburg* (Goettingen, 1787); G. Ellis, *History of the Late Revolution in the Dutch Republic* (London, 1787); De Pfau, *Histoire de la Campagne des Prussiens en Hollande en 1787* (Berlin, 1790); P. de Witt, *Une Invasion Prussienne en Hollande en 1787* (Paris, 1886); F. Luckwaldt, *Die Englisch-Preussische Allianz von 1788* (Leipzig, 1902); Hertzberg, *Recueil des . . . Traités*, etc. (1778-1789), 2 vols. (Berlin, 1789); von Ranke, *Die Deutschen Mächte und der Fürstenbund*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1871-1872); H. T. Colenbrander, *De Patriottentijd hoofdzakelijk naar buitenlandsche Bescheiden* (Hague, 1897, in progress).

the duke was got rid of, foreign influences reigned supreme at the Stadholder's court. Unimpressive in person and torpid in mind, he presented a complete contrast to his consort Wilhelmina, sister of the prince who was soon to become Frederick William II. of Prussia, who possessed not only tact and energy but also the power of inspiring enthusiasm. Sir James Harris who went as British minister to the Hague in December, 1784, wrote soon afterward: "I discover daily many great and good qualities in this Princess: she has a due sense of her situation, and spirit and abilities *equal to anything*; but he, from that contemptible jealousy ever attendant on imbecility, had rather be crushed by his own awkwardness than saved by her dexterity."²

The party which sought to lessen his powers, and probably to abolish the stadholderate, also strove to weaken the federal tie between the provinces and to undermine the authority of the States General and the Council of State. This party, styled the Patriots, had long enjoyed the support of France. The ambassadors sent from Versailles, first Vauguyon and then Vêrac, encouraged them in their assaults on the central institutions; and after the war, the party of the constitution, or Orange party, which favored an alliance with England or Prussia, steadily lost ground, partly owing to the inactivity of the prince and the unpopularity of England, but also because Frederick the Great, uncle of the Princess of Orange, refused to support her consort, and even pressed him to come to terms with France. Though Pitt and his foreign secretary, the Marquis of Carmarthen, sent Earl Cornwallis on an informal mission to Berlin for the purpose of framing a friendly understanding between the two powers, mainly on the Dutch Question, yet the old monarch declined the proposal and rebuked his envoy at London for lending it his support.³ The cause of the Prince of Orange therefore declined, despite the tact and energy which Sir James Harris displayed in its defense. That envoy on December 14, 1784, reported that the British party was "dejected, depressed and divided". But he added on January 4, 1785, that if the prince acted with energy, two-thirds of the country would obey his call.⁴

At that time, and indeed throughout the years 1785 and 1786, Pitt refused to allow Harris a free hand at the Hague. His instructions were to do all that was possible by diplomatic means to prevent the fall of the Stadholder, but on no account to commit Great Britain to a policy which might lead to war. The position of foreign

² *Diaries and Correspondence of the first Earl of Malmesbury*, II. 97.

³ *Cornwallis Correspondence*, I. 206-210; Hertzberg, *Recueil*, II. 413-416.

⁴ *Malmesbury Diaries*, II. 79, 93. See also Colenbrander, *op. cit.*, I. (Appendix), for documents showing the decline of the Stadholder's party.

affairs no less than the urgent need of retrenchment and reform at home called for the greatest caution; and we must therefore take a brief survey of the international situation, which, as will appear, determined Pitt's action in the Dutch Question.

A perusal of the letters of Pitt, Carmarthen and Harris at this time shows the extreme difficulty of gaining an ally for the beaten and discredited island power. Proposal after proposal was made to Vienna and Petersburg only to be waved aside or rudely repulsed. It is significant of the deep distrust haunting the courts of London and Berlin, that, with the exception of the tentative overtures made through Cornwallis, no advances were made by either of these governments. Resentment at the events of 1761 was too keen at Berlin, and suspicion of Frederick's supposed designs on Hanover was too rife at Windsor, for any friendly intercourse. British ministers and their envoys alike believed that either Russia or Austria was their natural ally. Of the two, Russia was preferred, an alliance with Emperor Joseph II. being valued mainly because it would dissolve the "unnatural" union of the houses of Hapsburg and Bourbon. The letters and memoranda which passed between Pitt and Carmarthen show that the two statesmen were in general agreement, except that Pitt adhered more resolutely to a peaceful policy and felt rather less animus against France than his foreign minister. This was especially the case in the year 1786, the year of the commercial treaty with France. Even then, however, Pitt felt suspicious of French *policy*, as his letters to Eden amply show.⁵

The position was therefore exceedingly difficult in the years 1785 and 1786. The hostility of France was always to be feared; she had the alliance of Emperor Joseph II.; and he in his turn was closely connected, though not by any formal treaty, with Catharine II. Further, when George III. in his electoral capacity joined the Fürstenbund (August, 1785), those sovereigns manifested their annoyance in a very marked degree.⁶ Yet so deep-seated was the mutual distrust of the courts of London and Berlin that, despite the efforts of Hertzberg and of Ewart, the British secretary of legation at Berlin, no advance was made toward an Anglo-Prussian *entente*. In fact the two states felt almost identical reasons for moving with extreme caution, namely, that any decided action might lead to the formation of a triple alliance between the imperial courts and France. On August 8, 1785, Carmarthen wrote to Harris setting forth the threatening language of Woronzoff, Russian ambassador at London, as to the hostile compact which Catharine II. would

⁵ *Auckland Journals*, I. 106, 127, 266.

⁶ *Hertzberg, Recueil*, II. 292 ff.; *Malmesbury Diaries*, II. 131-135.

form with France as well as Austria in case Hanover joined the Fürstenbund.⁷ The threats were very properly scorned by George III.; but the danger was so far real as to impose the greatest caution. Harris was so imbued by the anti-Prussian spirit prevalent in the British diplomatic service that, in a "private" letter of August 23, 1785, to Carmarthen, he replied in the following jaunty terms: "As for the King of Prussia, if he is sincere, he will die; if not, he will of course deceive us; in both cases he should be used only as a tool; and by being forced to speak out himself, compel others to declare themselves." On September 9 he informed Carmarthen that he had striven hard to convince the Princess of Orange that England would help her more than Prussia would. He hoped greatly to gain her confidence—"as, if ever Europe recovers its senses sufficiently to admit of the formation of a wise system, the great *remora* which would stand in the way of this country [the Dutch Netherlands] becoming part of it would be the Princess of Orange's predilection for Prussia."⁸

On October 9, 1785, at the time when France was about to mediate between the emperor and the Dutch Netherlands respecting the Scheldt and Maestricht disputes, Harris sent to Carmarthen two memoirs. The former referred to plans for retarding the course of that mediation and the projected Franco-Dutch treaty; in the latter he thus described the measures which should be used for the recovery of Great Britain's position in Europe:

HAGUE, October 12, 1785.

In order ultimately to separate the House of Austria from that of Bourbon, which ought to be the chief and systematick pursuit of Great Britain, no approaches should at this moment be made towards forming an alliance either with Prussia or the Emperor, but a sufficient degree of intimacy kept up at both these Courts to leave them hopes that they will make part of a system we wish to form with Russia, towards which Court all our negotiations ought to be directed. We may safely tell the Empress that she labours under a glaring error in supposing that the accession of Hanover to the German League is an obstacle in the way of an alliance between Her Imperial Majesty and Great Britain. That it does not even militate against an alliance with the Emperor, and that it by no means amounts to a proof, as her Ministers affect to say, that England is determined at all rates [*sic*] to unite itself with Prussia. That the recent friendly and confidential overtures made at Petersburg, and which went even to an indirect proposal of a Triple Alliance with the two Imperial Courts, prove beyond a doubt that a contrary opinion prevails in the English Cabinet, and that it depended on the Emperor alone, if he had known how to set a just value on the friendly offers which came from thence, to have consolidated the most wise and most salutary system he can ever adopt.

⁷ Brit. Mus., Add. MSS., 28060.

⁸ *Ibid.*

That, whatever the sentiments of His Imperial Majesty may be at this moment, England, in order to give the Empress of Russia an undoubted instance of confidence, and with a view to do away [with] the very unjustifiable suspicions she seems disposed to entertain, does not scruple to say under the seal of the greatest secrecy, that no thoughts exist in the minds of the British Ministers of entering into any systematick engagements with the Court of Berlin, *unless compelled to them by events*. That to leave no doubt of the veracity of this assertion, the Court of London is ready to conclude immediately a separate treaty of defensive alliance with Russia and Denmark on such conditions as Her Imperial Majesty may deem the most advantageous to their common interests and the best adapted to the present times. It will be then evident that England cannot have any engagements contrary to the interests of Russia either in Germany or elsewhere, particularly as the Empress herself acknowledges the Treaties of Westphalia and Teschen to be sufficient sureties for the Germanic constitution.

Should this Triple Alliance succeed, besides the weight England would derive from having a footing on the Continent, it will greatly tend to facilitate the putting an end to the Treaty of 1756,⁹ since not only the insinuations of the Empress may greatly contribute to open the Emperor's eyes, but also his fears will be awakened, and he will be apprehensive that, if he refuses a connection with England, when that Court has formed one with Petersburg, [that] his interests there must sink and those of the King of Prussia rise.¹⁰

It is not a little curious that the diplomatist who three years later won fame and a peerage by his skilful framing of an Anglo-Prussian alliance at Loo, should here scout the idea of such a connection. Carmarthen returned a brief but friendly answer; and the British Foreign Office continued to angle vainly for support at the two imperial courts, even when Frederick William II. succeeded to the crown of the Hohenzollerns (August 17, 1786). In truth, that event made little difference in the relations of Prussia to Great Britain and Holland.¹¹ The new monarch repulsed the entreaties of his sister, the Princess of Orange, for help. The Prussian envoy at the Hague, Thulemeyer, continued to intrigue with the Patriots, against the Stadholder; so that finally the princess begged Frederick William to impose on Thulemeyer at least a policy of neutrality.¹²

In such circumstances the active intervention of Great Britain would have been worse than useless. Carmarthen aimed chiefly at weakening the Austro-French compact, but with little success.¹³ It was therefore in vain that Sir James Harris continued to assure

⁹ The alliance between France and Austria framed chiefly by Kaunitz.

¹⁰ Brit. Mus., Add. MSS., 28060.

¹¹ Lecky, V. 80, is incorrect in saying that his accession made a great change. No change was observable till June-July, 1787.

¹² F. O., Prussia, no. 11, Dalrymple to Carmarthen, April 21, 1787.

¹³ *Political Memoranda of the Duke of Leeds*, edited by Mr. Oscar Browning, pp. 106, 107.

ministers that the United Provinces were about to fall under the control of France. The successful inroads of the Patriots on the Stadholder's power aroused little interest at Whitehall; and when Harris came over to give ministers fuller information on these complex affairs, Pitt still adhered strictly to his policy of neutrality, though a majority of ministers now desired actively to intervene.¹⁴ All that was done was to vote a sum of £20,000 for secret use by the provinces loyal to the Stadholder; on June 10 the further sum of £70,000 was accorded to Harris for that purpose.¹⁵

It is at this point, shortly before the crisis arrived, that we may expand the narrative, adding those parts of the most important despatches which throw light on the situation.

On his return to the Hague, Harris found that the Patriots had gained complete mastery of Amsterdam; and on June 15 the States General were weak enough to admit the deputies sent by the illegal States of Utrecht, that city having broken away from the rest of the province and set up a legislature in hostility to the provincial States. This accession of strength to the Patriots in the States General enabled them to pass measures depriving the Stadholder of the right to order the march or disposal of the armed forces in the provinces outside the province of Holland, that province having already adopted that rigorous measure.

Four days later, however, the efforts of Harris, probably furthered by British gold, availed to secure the rejection of these decrees.¹⁶ Thus the majority in the States General was kept for the Stadholder—a matter of the utmost importance, as it prevented a formal demand of that body for the intervention of France, which would probably have led to war. Pitt and Carmarthen still hoped to settle matters by diplomacy or by a friendly mediation; and on June 6, 1787, the latter sent a despatch to Harris stating that if the province of Holland (which was more populous and wealthy than all the other provinces taken together) seceded from the Union and appealed to France, care must be taken that an application for the mediation of Great Britain should come from the four loyal provinces (Gelderland, Friesland, Zeeland and Utrecht) and from the two doubtful provinces, Groningen and Overijssel, if it were possible. He added that "Nothing could lay so good a ground for our further interference, or so much dispose the nation in favour of the Republic, as a direct application from the majority of the Provinces, and a

¹⁴ See Harris's notes on the cabinet meeting of May 23, 1787, at which he was present, in *Malmesbury Diaries*, II. 303-306.

¹⁵ F. O., Holland, no. 14, Carmarthen to Harris, June 10, 1787.

¹⁶ *Malmesbury Diaries*, II. 313-319.

prospect of reviving a connection which has repeatedly proved so beneficial to both countries."¹⁷

In the early summer of 1787 the Stadholder and the Princess of Orange rallied their friends, and hoped to secure soon the reduction of the city of Utrecht by force. The prospects of the "constitutional" party were therefore far from hopeless, despite the aid constantly though secretly given by France to the Free Corps. These bodies of armed burghers in the spring and summer of 1787 forcibly changed the regency, or government, of several towns, despoiled the property of opponents, and drew a cordon along the borders of the province of Holland so as to ensure the subjection of all its towns.

The question of intervention therefore became acute. The Princess of Orange, from her safe retreat in the fortress of Nimeguen, had sought to stir up Frederick William of Prussia to her assistance, and had ventured to send assurances that he would have the support of Great Britain. Ewart, the able and energetic secretary of the British legation at Berlin, reported to Carmarthen on June 12 that the Prussian statesman, Hertzberg, had been assured by the Princess of Orange of "the very favourable and encouraging assurances they had got at Nimeguen of the good disposition of the Court of Great Britain to maintain the constitution of the Republic, and that the effects should be made manifest when circumstances required it."¹⁸ She therefore begged Hertzberg to concert a plan of operations with England. Hertzberg sent her letter on to the king and hoped for good results. For many months that statesman and Ewart had been working hard to bring about an Anglo-Prussian alliance, but hitherto in vain. The Dutch Question, as they saw, ought to lead to such an arrangement; and soon the action of the Princess of Orange in determining to make her way through the cordon of the Free Corps and proceed to the Hague for the encouragement of her friends, brought the question to an acute phase.

She would scarcely have taken that step had she not known that Frederick William had recently been annoyed by the refusal of the French court to arrange with him a plan of settlement not unfavorable to the Stadholder. Montmorin, the French foreign minister, replied in very curt terms to the Prussian proposal, accusing the Stadholder of being the cause of the troubles, and warning the King of Prussia that any intervention on his part in support of the prince

¹⁷ F. O., Holland, no. 14.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Prussia, no. 11. Lord Dalrymple, British ambassador at Berlin, had gone home for his health. Ewart remained as *chargé d'affaires* until August, 1788, when he became ambassador with full powers to sign the Anglo-Prussian treaty of that month.

"ne serviroit qu'à le compromettre seul, en pure perte".¹⁹ Ewart reported that this reply had much irritated Frederick William; and the princess was aware of his change of front. What circumstance led her to believe that Great Britain was ready to intervene is matter for conjecture. Carmarthen, and still more so Pitt, had enjoined on Harris a policy of watchful but strict neutrality, and these orders were repeated on June 6. He was urged to prevent the break-up of the United Provinces, if possible; if it occurred, he might remove from the Hague with the deputies of the seceding provinces; but England must not be committed to a policy of intervention.²⁰

On hearing, however, of the energy and hopefulness of the Princess of Orange, Carmarthen sent the following despatch to Harris. In view of the statement of French historians—*e. g.*, that of M. Dareste—"Il (*i. e.*, Pitt) nous prépara un échec diplomatique en Hollande"²¹—it should be noticed how exceedingly cautious and pacific was the tone of the British minister:

The communication made to the King of Prussia by the Princess of Orange can certainly in no degree pledge His Majesty, and perhaps it may be attended with advantage if the general idea that this country may possibly take some share in the events now depending is conveyed in this Manner to the French Court. At the same time His Majesty's servants think that the expressions, particularly the concluding part of the last par.—"qu'Elle prend Intérêt, que son discours au Parlement le prouve, et qu'Elle le montrera dans l'occasion"—seem to imply that H. M. had given some positive assurances that there might exist an occasion on which H. M. had already determined to take part by open interference if the constitution and independence of the Republic were in danger. I am persuaded you did not, and I hope the Princess did not, consider them as conveying this meaning, which would certainly go beyond the sentiments I have so often expressed to you and which are particularly repeated in my last despatch; that H. M.'s conduct in any future contingency must depend upon the view of many circumstances, which it has not yet been possible to ascertain, particularly the strength and exertions of the well affected part of the Republic.

He then added that Great Britain must not be involved in any intercourse which may take place between the Princess of Orange and the Prussian court; and that any arrangement between Great Britain and Prussia must depend on the international situation. The Emperor Joseph II. would be more likely to intervene effectively than Prussia.²²

As has been hinted, the Dutch Question entered on a new phase when the Princess of Orange attempted to make her way into Hol-

¹⁹ F. O., Prussia, no. 11, Ewart to Carmarthen, June 16 and 23.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Holland, no. 14, Carmarthen to Harris, June 6, 1787.

²¹ Dareste, *Histoire de France*, VII. 112.

²² F. O., Holland, no. 15.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—18.

land. She was stopped near Schoonhoven on the border of that province by a body of the Free Corps and was compelled by the decision of the States of Holland to return to Nimeguen. The motives which induced that princess to undertake the journey to the Hague, the change in the policy of Frederick William and of Pitt, and the discussions which ensued with France, are too complex to be set forth here. They will be recounted in the forthcoming work of the writer—"The Life and Times of William Pitt the Younger". Here it must suffice to quote some of the despatches which prove that the British government, while resolving to support the King of Prussia in his demand for complete reparation for the insult to his sister, yet continued to press for a friendly mediation of Great Britain, France and Prussia in Dutch affairs, such as had been mooted shortly before the occurrence of the incident at Schoonhoven. The following despatch of July 17, from Carmarthen to Ewart, was called forth by a report industriously circulated by Thulemeyer, and sent by him to Berlin, that in no case would England intervene by force on behalf of her partizans. The first sentence merely states that Ewart's despatch of July 7 had arrived yesterday. The despatch then continues:

No report could be falser than this—"That His Majesty had determined not to interfere at all in the Dutch affair, or that Mr. Pitt had made any representations against it"; and it is impossible that M. de Thulemeyer (if he in fact transmitted it) could believe it to be true. Altho' His [Britannic] Majesty would never set the example of foreign interference in the domestic concerns of the Republic, he could by no means see with indifference the attempts of any other Power to destroy its independence. And in fact H. M. has instructed His Minister at The Hague to observe attentively what was going on there with a view to any measures that might contribute to the restoration of harmony and the support of the constitution. You may add that H. M.'s first step in such a business would have been a direct communication with His Prussian Majesty, who, on account of the near relationship of the Princess of Orange towards His Prussian Majesty, and of his connections as so near a neighbour to the Republic, must be deeply interested in whatever concerns her, had not H. M. received repeated accounts from The Hague that the conduct of M. de Thulemeyer had been in uniform hostility to the interests of the House of Orange, and in direct concert with the emissaries of France—a circumstance which could not but shake the opinion H. M. would naturally have formed of the King of Prussia's sentiments on those subject. But if M. de Thulemeyer has ventured to pursue the conduct he has held without authority from his Court, and H. P. M. feels an interest in the independence of the Republic, in the preservation of its constitution, and in the support of the rights of the Stadtholder, H. M. will be extremely ready to enter into a most confidential communication with His Prussian Majesty on the means of preserving the essential objects I have just mentioned.

Carmarthen then stated that Montmorin had explicitly declared that France did not think herself authorized to intervene, as that would draw on an interference from other powers; that France desired to settle the dispute amicably by a joint mediation. His Majesty had not thought that

the Province of Holland could have been so mad as not to have instantly complied with His Prussian Majesty's very just demand of reparation and punishment. Any steps His Prussian Majesty may be under the necessity of taking on this occasion must be considered as totally distinct from an open interference in the domestic affairs of the Republic (which of course will depend on other grounds), and as only requiring that satisfaction which is due from one of the Provinces for a gross insult offered to H. P. M. in the person of his sister.

Carmarthen further states that the emperor is equally concerned in restoring order to his Netherlands; and he asks whether an agreement could not be arrived at, seeing that the Patriots are "*suspected of fomenting* the discontents in the Austrian Netherlands".

"Could such a good understanding be agreed on, there can be little doubt but the affairs of Holland would be settled in an amicable way to the satisfaction of all those who are interested in the welfare of the Republic."²³

This last sentence of the draft of the despatch is in Pitt's handwriting, and it is significant that he should have appended a sentence of this markedly pacific tendency. The standpoint of the British government, therefore, was perfectly clear. One of the Dutch provinces had insulted the sister of the King of Prussia. It must apologize for that insult; and thereafter Great Britain, France, Prussia and the emperor could arrange for a joint mediation in the affairs of the United Provinces. France also did not at that time dispute the right of the Prussian monarch to gain satisfaction; and had she used her great influence in the States of Holland to procure an adequate apology, it is probable that such a mediation would have been amicably arranged. In order to gain further information on the complex constitutional questions there at issue the British government despatched Mr. William Wyndham Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville) to the Hague, where he arrived on July 30. He was then joint paymaster of the forces and had undertaken no diplomatic duties; but his cool and practical nature qualified him for the task; and the long letters which passed between him, Pitt and others, from July 31 to August 20, when he returned, throw much light on the situation.²⁴ They prove the urgent desire of Pitt for a

²³ F. O., Prussia, no. 11, Carmarthen to Ewart, July 17, 1787. The proposal to include the emperor as mediator was soon dropped.

²⁴ See the Addenda in *Dropmore Papers*, III. 408 ff.; also two of the same letters (cut down) in the MSS. of P. V. Smith, reprinted in the Beaufort MSS.,

peaceful solution of the problem, but also his resolve to make preparations for war in case France threatened to intervene by force against the Prussians. In the British Foreign Office Records (France, no. 25) there is a draft of a despatch to Eden, dated Whitehall, August 10, 1787, entirely in Pitt's writing, and the official copy sent off is identical with it. Therein Pitt informed Eden of the rumored preparations by France which would thwart "the great work of conciliation which it is so much the object of the two Courts to forward and promote". He added that Great Britain would probably respond to the appeal of the loyal provinces, Friesland and Zeeland, for her intervention on their behalf, and then referred to the increasing violence of the Free Corps and the need of bringing about a complete cessation of hostilities before the mediation of the three powers could take place with effect. Eden had been authorized to propose that England and France should agree to discontinue their naval preparations until further notice; and on August 4 the French foreign minister acceded to this plan.²⁵ But it is clear that the entry of French volunteers into the United Provinces and the excesses of the Free Corps (as notified by Harris in his urgent despatch of August 20) led the British government to take more decided measures on August 24, as will presently appear.

Meanwhile the refusal of the States of Holland to accord adequate reparation to the King of Prussia led to the assembly of the expeditionary force at Wesel; but the vacillations at Berlin continued and were the cause of much perplexity to Hertzberg, Ewart and Harris. Dr. Luckwaldt has also shown that the force at Wesel was not ready to march by July 20, as M. de Witt had asserted, but was scarcely prepared by September 7, so the Duke of Brunswick averred.²⁶ In fact, the *dénouement* came very slowly, owing to the influence which the French party at Berlin brought to bear on the king, and the apprehensions which he entertained of Austria. His fears of a joint attack from France and the Hapsburg Power, together with the intrigues of Finckenstein at Berlin, Thulemeyer at the Hague, and the equally Francophile Goltz at Paris, probably account for the overture which the court of Berlin sent to that of Versailles in the third week of July, with a view to a joint mediation by those two governments alone in the Dutch Question. Had the three ministers above named solely directed the course of affairs, the

Historical Manuscripts Commission Report, XII., part ix., pp. 355-357; also the excellent monograph of Professor E. D. Adams, *The Influence of Grenville on Pitt's Foreign Policy* (Washington, 1904).

²⁵ F. O., France, no. 25, Eden to Carmarthen, August 4, 1787.

²⁶ Luckwaldt, *op. cit.*, p. 80, note; P. de Witt, *Une Invasion Prussienne en Hollande en 1787*, p. 235.

result would probably have been a shabby compromise. But Hertzberg, as he informed Ewart, had taken care to work on the susceptibilities of Frederick William by suggesting that any action conjointly with France would be impossible unless she consented to the following preliminary conditions: (1) a full reparation to the Prince and Princess of Orange for the insult; (2) the recognition of the Stadholder as forming an integral part of the Dutch constitution and not as a personage whose claims might be considered separately (as France had recently claimed); (3) a formal request emanating from the States General for the two powers to mediate; (4) the withdrawal of the troops of the province of Holland from the province of Utrecht, and an undertaking of Holland not to interfere with that or the other provinces; (5) the according permission immediately by the States of Holland to the princess to proceed to the Hague. Hertzberg informed Ewart that the king had accepted these conditions and that the court of Versailles would almost certainly reject them.²⁷

This proved to be the case. The resolve of the French court to treat the insult as a negligible affair, and to regard the Prince of Orange as almost external to the Dutch constitution made a bad impression on the Prussian monarch, so Ewart reported on August 9; and, as the States of Holland still refused the required reparation, the question of a Franco-Prussian mediation lapsed. Nevertheless there was more wavering at Berlin, owing to some indiscreet words which Eden let fall at Versailles, probably to Count Goltz, which he transmitted to Berlin, implying that he [Eden] said "that the satisfaction [for the insult] was not a point worth enforcing by arms, and that the march of the Prussian troops must be in the way of the mediation [*sic*]". The report of these words, whether correct or not, produced a sensation at Berlin, and caused ministers to write at once to their envoy at London, Count Lusi, to inquire whether the British minister was about to change front. Of course it met with an entire denial; and Pitt, on September 8, sent a courteous but firm rebuke to Eden, accompanied with a request for an explanation of the incident. It is unfortunate that this part of his letter should have been omitted by the editor of the *Auckland Correspondence*, and quite needlessly, for in a letter of September 19 to Eden, Pitt frankly accepted Eden's explanation of "the supposed conversation between you and Baron Goltz".²⁸

²⁷ F. O., Prussia, no. 11, Ewart to Carmarthen, July 17. See also Luckwaldt, *op. cit.*, pp. 65 ff.

²⁸ The parts omitted from the *Auckland Correspondence*, I. 191-192, are given in the MSS. of P. V. Smith in the Beaufort MSS., *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report*, XII., part ix., p. 357. See also the *Auckland Correspondence*, I. 198.

These intrigues of Goltz, Thulemeyer and others delayed the *entente* between Great Britain and Prussia; and it was not until definite assurances of support were sent from London to Berlin on August 24 that the diplomatic horizon began to clear. The more decided attitude then taken by the British government resulted from the accentuation of the crisis in Holland. Despite the pacific assurances showered by Montmorin upon Eden, which that envoy received in a very trustful spirit, it was obvious that French agents in Holland were doing their utmost to encourage the Patriots. Montmorin probably acted with sincerity, at least it is difficult to reconcile his resolve (formed about August 20) to recall the mischief-maker, Vêrac, with the duplicity of which Carmarthen more than once accused him in his despatches to Eden. Still, there can be no doubt that French volunteers strengthened the Free Corps, and that the confident expectation of French help rendered the States of Holland obdurate.²⁹ The despatches which Carmarthen forwarded to Harris, Ewart and Eden on August 24 show that the British government had then come to consider war as probable. Its alarm was probably caused by Harris's despatch of August 20 describing the march of a body of Free Corps towards the Hague, and his precautions in sending away the archives of the legation and in preparing to retreat with the Stadholder's friends to Brill, where they might be defended by British ships. The capture of the arsenal at Delft by the Free Corps also seemed imminent; and that event would deprive the Orange party of the munitions of war. On August 21 Harris described the capture of Delft; but probably the latter despatch was not received before Carmarthen wrote the decisive missives of August 24. That which he sent to Ewart had the effect of fixing the wavering purposes of the Prussian monarch (so our envoy stated in his despatch of September 4) and inducing him to forward the ultimatum to the States of Holland and to order the Duke of Brunswick to prepare for the advance. The arrival on September 7 of news concerning the rupture between Turkey and Russia helped to clinch the resolve of Frederick William; and even Finckenstein now favored armed intervention in Holland.³⁰ It is curious, as showing the close connection of all parts of the European system, that the resolve of the Sultan to break away from Russian tutelage should have sealed the doom of the democrats in Holland. But so it was. Russia and Austria were thenceforth too occupied

²⁹ There seem grounds for thinking that Ségur, who held the Ministry for War up to August, 1787, was responsible for this help to the Patriots.

³⁰ F. O., Prussia, Ewart to Carmarthen, September 8, 1787.

to combine against Prussia; and the court of Berlin had no fear of France alone, provided that help from England was assured.

Carmarthen's note of August 24 left no doubt on that point. While stating that Eden had been charged to induce the court of Versailles to acquiesce in Prussia's action, he added that steps were being taken to engage a body of Hessians for the British service. In a secret despatch of the same date he declared that, though naval preparations had been discontinued, Great Britain could send out at short notice a naval force fully equal to that of the French; she would support the King of Prussia, and would act quickly if the need arose.

In the despatch to Harris at the Hague (August 24, 1787) Carmarthen declared that, as France was arming, England would adopt precautionary measures; Lieutenant-General Fawcett had gone to Cassel for the purpose above named, and he would, if necessary, engage 5000 Hessians for the service of the provinces loyal to the Stadholder. A ship would be stationed at Harwich, charged with warlike stores, which Harris might summon if he thought fit.³¹

Equally significant is Carmarthen's despatch of August 24 to Eden at Versailles. In it he traversed the contention of the French government that their proposed camp at Givet was a natural and proper retort to the assembly of Prussian troops at Wesel. He declared that Great Britain, while entirely approving of the action of His Prussian Majesty in demanding satisfaction from the States of Holland, hoped that it might be obtained

without having recourse to extremities; and His Majesty would gladly contribute by all the means in his power to its being amicably arranged; but while the party in Holland persists in refusing this just demand, it appears to His Majesty perfectly just and natural that the King of Prussia should take the necessary steps for enabling him to support it with effect.

He then stated that France could have no interest in opposing this demand which was one of personal honor. If France disliked the King of Prussia's action she should prevail on her party in Holland to offer satisfaction to him. The next thing would be to arrange a suspension of hostilities in the United Provinces, which could be done only by breaking up the cordon of troops, limiting the forces in the provinces to the ordinary quota, and disarming the Free Corps. He then suggested that this might be so done as to give advantage to neither side, the Free Corps giving up their arms on the appointed day to commissioners named by the three mediating powers, who should prevent their recovery by either party unless the

³¹ F. O., Holland, no. 17.

negotiations failed. In that case the arms would be returned to their former owners. The conduct of the province of Holland, however, rendered this plan precarious. Another suspicious circumstance was the number of French soldiers in the Free Corps. As for the Prussian proposals for a settlement, they had had the approval of His Majesty.³²

The opinion of the British government, then, was that the action of the King of Prussia toward the province of Holland was an indispensable preliminary to the joint mediation of the three powers. Naturally enough, France demurred to this view, seeing that she was allied to the United Provinces by the treaty of 1785. The weak side of her case was that she did not persuade the States of Holland to make due reparation. Some of her historians, notably Count Barral de Montferrat, have treated the insult as a very trifling affair, which was adequately explained by the States of Holland.³³ But it is certain that the Prussian monarch did not, and could not, take that view. His hesitation to take decided action is to be regarded, not as a sign that he thought little of the affair, but rather as a proof of his mental instability and of the concern felt at Berlin for the isolation of Prussia and the hostility of Austria. Finally, on September 3, he took the step noticed before; but Ewart declared that he grounded his resolve partly on the reasoning of the Duke of Brunswick, that the seeking of reparation for the insult was distinct from the question of mediation. Grenville had gone to Nimeguen to confer with the Duke of Brunswick;³⁴ and it is probable that the advice which the duke forwarded to the King of Prussia came originally from Whitehall.

That the States of the province of Holland reckoned on armed help from France is clear from the fact that they rejected the Prussian ultimatum above referred to, and on September 9, 1787, sent a pressing request for help to the court of Versailles. Two of the burgomasters of Patriot towns, Utrecht and Gorcum, also proceeded to Paris a little later and expressed themselves to W. A. Miles as certain of securing it.³⁵ A favorable view of French policy may be seen in the Auckland Papers; but it is necessary to supplement them by documents drawn from the British Foreign Office. On September 4 the British envoy, William Eden, received a confidential note from Montmorin, which traversed the contentions of the British and Prussian governments described above. Montmorin defended the

³² F. O., France, no. 25.

³³ Barral de Montferrat, *Dix Ans de Paix Armée* (1893), chs. XIII., XIV.

³⁴ *Dropmore Papers*, III. 413.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, III. 435.

violent actions of the Free Corps in the United Provinces and even stated that the towns where they had forcibly changed the magistrates "ont déjà consommé la réforme: . . . c'est une affaire terminée". As for the Prince of Orange, he must abdicate in favor of his son. In view of the very critical state of French politics it is difficult to see why Montmorin (despite his personal leaning towards peace) should have adopted this provocative tone. Perhaps it was an attempt to browbeat Great Britain and Prussia. If such was his aim, he failed. On September 8, Carmarthen instructed Eden to protest against the excesses of the Free Corps, which were often officered by Frenchmen. He further stated that an unpleasant impression had been created at Whitehall by the delay of France to accede definitely to the proposals for a joint mediation and pacification of the United Provinces; that no mediation would be possible until the Free Corps were disarmed and disbanded; and that the conduct of England had in no wise changed.

The resulting interview of Eden with Montmorin on September 11 was "unpleasant". Montmorin upbraided Eden with the ceaseless suspicions of France harbored by the British government. He even charged it with seeking to amuse France with negotiations, while concocting hostile plans with Prussia. As for disarming the Free Corps, it was as impossible as to control the waves of the sea. France, he asserted, could only very slightly influence the Patriots. No settlement whatever could be arrived at if the Prussians advanced; and in that case hostilities must be the result. He then referred to the rupture between Russia and Turkey as an unfortunate event, and added that France would seek to prevent the destruction of the Ottoman Empire.³⁶ On September 13 he showed to Eden the appeal for help that had come from the States of Holland, which, he declared, France could not refuse. He accused England of inciting Prussia to this action, though, as he averred, perfectly satisfactory explanations had been given of the slight offered to the Princess of Orange.³⁷ The answer of the British government, on September 19, to these threatening declarations is too long to be quoted in full, but it may be thus summarized:

His Majesty feels deep regret at the resolve of the French court to take steps which so directly lead to a rupture. His Majesty still hopes to see the Dutch troubles peacefully settled; but he cannot be a quiet spectator of armed interference on the part of France.

³⁶ F. O., France, no. 26, Eden to Carmarthen, September 11, 1787. This last statement refutes that of Count Barral de Montferrat, *op. cit.*, p. 217, that Montmorin looked on the Eastern war as opening up more promising vistas for Prussia than Holland offered; *e. g.*, a raid into Bohemia or Finland!

³⁷ *Auckland Journals*, I. 522-530.

The British government has not departed from its avowed intentions. M. Montmorin himself formerly expressed a desire for satisfaction to the King of Prussia, but no result accrued from it. The notes of the States of Holland resemble a justification more than an apology. The States General have often disavowed the acts of the States of Holland; and France, if she interferes, will "be supporting a party who act in direct opposition to the sentiments of that ally" (the United Provinces). His Majesty must therefore give orders for naval preparations; but he will strive to avert the evils of war, and will carry on the negotiations. No answer has been received to the British proposals in the despatch of August 24 for the basis of joint mediation. The violence of the Free Corps and the avowed inability of France to restrain them make it necessary that disarmament shall be the first of such proposals; but if this be impossible at the outset, it must take place in the sequel as a prelude to any settlement. The pay of the troops disbanded by the province of Holland must also be paid. For the rest, the Prussian proposals may well be taken as a basis, as Montmorin has not formally objected to them. The Stadholder must also be restored to his duties as captain-general, and to his powers as specified in 1766. If this is agreed to, very much may be hoped from the joint mediation of the three courts. No notice will be taken of the charges of insincerity against England.

Another despatch to Eden of the same date informed him that Grenville would at once proceed to Paris on a special mission. The instructions drawn up for his guidance, dated September 21, require him firstly to discover whether peace may be preserved. The chief points to be aimed at are the right of the King of Prussia to gain reparation for the insult to his family. The settlement of Dutch affairs must also be such as to preserve the constitution in its essential points, and authority must not be allowed to pass into the hands of those opposed to Great Britain. This must be distinctly stated to the French court, and any opposition to this must be regarded as a sign of hostility. Any changes in the *Règlements* of some of the provinces must be referred to the free deliberations of their States. Any attempt of the French court to protract the discussions must be discouraged as far as possible.

Other despatches of the same date to Harris and Ewart make it clear that the British government still looked forward to a joint mediation of the three powers. The obvious inability of France to draw the sword did not lead the British cabinet to decide to oust her from the proposed mediation. On the contrary, if she had recognized the facts of the situation, or showed a desire to co-operate on

the lines above described, she could have played her part in the solution of the problem. Why she decided to hold entirely aloof is hard to fathom; but the facts now to be set forth may help us to a surmise which seems to suit the facts of the case.

The Prussians crossed the Dutch frontier on September 13. The resistance of the Free Corps was easily overcome; and the Prince of Orange entered the Hague on September 20, amidst the enthusiasm of the citizens, a majority of whom had favored his cause there as in the rural districts of the province of Holland. In fact, the feeble stand made by the Patriots against a force of about 25,000 men proves that they had not the bulk of the nation on their side. The Dutch, when united and determined, have ever made a stubborn defense of their land.

Harris clinched the triumph of the Orange party by inducing the States of Holland to reverse their decrees against the Stadholder and to rescind their resolution of September 9 appealing for armed help from France. As this action deprived the court of Versailles of all excuse for armed intervention, the despatch describing it deserves to be quoted nearly in full, especially as it has been (very strangely) omitted from the *Malmesbury Diaries*.

HARRIS TO CARMARTHEN.

No. 125.

HAGUE, Friday, 21 Sept., 1787.

I have succeeded in carrying through the States of Holland the Resolution I mentioned to your Lordship last night, but not without some difficulty; as, although all the towns except Amsterdam, Alkmaar and Hoorn are come round, it was in such direct contradiction to the sentiments they expressed a fortnight ago that they wished to defer it. I however insisted on the importance of the measure and on the necessity of celerity, and I succeeded.

This morning early I collected a few of my most confidential friends to agree on the terms in which this Resolution should be conceived, and I have the honor to enclose it, as we then drew it up, and as it has since passed. It was brought forward by Dordt³⁸ (a singular circumstance), seconded by the Equestrian Order, and, after a slight opposition on the part of Leyden and Gouda, carried unanimously. Sixteen towns out of the 19 were present. It will be despatched tonight to Versailles, and be communicated to M. Caillard, *chargé des affaires de France*, this evening. As far as my judgment reaches, it seems calculated to remove every pretext for the interference of France; or, if that Court does now interfere, it will put her so much in the wrong that she cannot claim or expect the assistance of any of her allies in a war which will have been entirely of her own seeking.

Besides the infinite advantages that always attend quick measures, I was anxious to get this through before the Prince of Orange took his Seat in the Estates of Holland in order that France might not throw

³⁸ Dort had recently sided against the Stadholder.

the odium of it on His Highness and make use of it as a handle to keep alive the resentment of her party against him.³⁹

The news of this crowning diplomatic success reached London on September 25, and Paris probably about the same time. Certainly Grenville knew of it before he had his first interview with Montmorin, on September 28. The letter which Grenville wrote to Pitt at Calais on September 23, in reply to one informing him of the first successes of the Prussians, shows that he fully appreciated the need of the conciliatory methods which Pitt had just prescribed.⁴⁰ Indeed, his conduct throughout was eminently cautious, though he now foresaw that France would give up the game as hopeless.

He found Montmorin reserved and cold. That minister declared that the principles which might formerly have been applicable to the Dutch problem were not so, now that Prussia had 25,000 men on Dutch soil. They must withdraw before negotiations could proceed. Grenville then sought to induce him to cancel the *Déclaration* which the French government had issued on September 16 as to its resolve to aid the province of Holland; but received the reply that it had been called forth by the march of the Prussian troops and would be annulled only when they retired; and he replied in similar terms to Grenville's suggestion that Great Britain and France should agree to discontinue their armaments. To this Grenville made answer that he could not with propriety discuss the question of the Prussian evacuation; and that the Dutch Question must be put in the way of a settlement before they retired. Montmorin then pressed him to draw up a plan of pacification; but this he declined to do, as it would be *ultra vires*.⁴¹

Their interview on October 1 was equally unsatisfactory; and a joint conference held by Grenville and Eden with Montmorin on October 2 was also without result, the French minister refusing to negotiate while the Prussians were in possession. Foreseeing no good from the continuance of these discussions, Grenville decided to return to London to apprise Pitt of the state of affairs. The cabinet fully approved his action and expressed surprise at the protests of France. But in point of fact the letters that passed between Pitt and Grenville show that both of them had divined the secret of the situation, that France could not draw the sword. As Pitt remarked, the chief danger was that she would be *hooted* into war by the populace.⁴² Seeing that the force at Givet had not begun to

³⁹ F. O., Holland, no. 18.

⁴⁰ For Pitt's letters of September 21 and 22 to Grenville, see the *Dropmore Papers*, III. 426, 427. For Grenville's mission, see E. D. Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7.

⁴¹ F. O., France, no. 26, Grenville to Carmarthen, September 28, 1787.

⁴² *Dropmore Papers*, III. 430-436.

assemble by the end of September,⁴³ the chief aim of the French minister seems to have been to back out of the dispute with as little loss of dignity as possible. The device of refusing to negotiate so long as the Prussians were in the United Provinces was well suited to this end; but it compelled France to look on in impotent wrath at the course of events in Holland, which reversed the masterful policy of Vergennes.

The truth seems to be that, in view of the protracted strife between the Crown and the Paris Parlement, the desperate state of the finances, and the need of watching closely the crisis in the Orient, Montmorin had decided that France must on no account go to war over the Dutch Question. On this topic he opened his heart with indiscreet fullness after a private dinner which he and Eden had together on Thursday, September 19. In the course of the conversation, which Eden reported as follows to Whitehall, Montmorin admitted that England's policy had been consistent. So far as his own feelings were concerned, he would tender the following advice to his sovereign:

If the Estates of Holland should prove so defenceless, or so intimidated as to give way to whatever might be forced under the present attack, he should advise the Most Christian King not to engage in a war, but, protesting against the conduct, to give refuge and protection at any practicable expense to all who might be driven from their country and might seek it. On the contrary, if the situation of things should prove such as to give a prospect of assisting with a hope of maintaining the Dutch constitution, and to protect an allied Province against a foreign attack, he would advise France to do it by all the means within her power. In the course of the conversation he gave me explicitly to understand, what he has often alluded to, that he has personally disliked the whole pursuit [*sic*] in Holland, and has wished in vain to find means to get creditably out of it, and also that he feels a solicitude to have the means of turning his attention more compleatly [*sic*] to the other side of Europe. My inference from the whole conversation was that, if the settling of the business in Holland can be accomplished speedily and effectually, and if immediate means are taken by [illegible] measures to moderate and reconcile all discontents within the [United] Provinces, a war will be avoided, which this country is ill prepared to undertake; and more especially at a moment when such exertions as she can make will be more urged towards another Quarter. I have been obliged to state this with some haste, but it appeared to me important, and I hope that I have made it intelligible.

I have etc.

WM. EDEN.⁴⁴

Probably these views of Montmorin were shared by Loménie de Brienne, Malesherbes and Lamoignon. Two ministers, Ségur and Castries, who had favored a forward policy at the Hague, had

⁴³ *Dropmore Papers*, III. 435.

⁴⁴ F. O., France, no. 26.

recently retired. The peace party therefore carried the day. Eden reported on September 16 that France had made efforts to induce Austria, Spain and even Saxony to espouse her cause.⁴⁵ Apparently, they came to naught; and the decision of the men of Amsterdam on October 6 to come to terms with the Duke of Brunswick, who had recently been blockading their city, seems to have quenched the last efforts of the war party at Versailles.

This unexpected turn of events naturally played into the hands of the Stadholder's party. That the British government felt the irregularity of the situation is clear from Carmarthen's despatch of October 5 to Harris. In it Carmarthen declared that all the operations of the Duke of Brunswick should be connected with the original demand for satisfaction to the King of Prussia, so as to prevent France from describing them as a direct interference in the internal affairs of that republic; for the apology to the King of Prussia was incomplete while an armed force protected the persons of those who had insulted the princess. No qualms as to the propriety of their proceedings seem to have troubled the Prussians and the Orange party. We may detect Pitt's hand in the following sentence: "It is certainly His Majesty's wish, as soon as the object in Holland is securely obtained, to terminate the business in such a way as may enable this country to disarm." This consummation was reached by the *Déclaration* and *Contre-Déclaration* signed by the British and French ministers at Versailles on October 27, in the latter of which Montmorin put forth the surprising assertion that it had never been the intention of His Most Christian Majesty forcibly to intervene in Dutch affairs.

The Orange reaction naturally brought about the formation of an Anglo-Dutch alliance, which replaced that with France. The details of the treaty, signed by Harris and Van der Spiegel at the Hague on April 15, 1788, are well known. The most unsatisfactory part of it was that relating to the proposed restitution to the United Provinces of Negapatam, which had been ceded to Great Britain in May, 1784. Negotiations were to be set on foot for its restitution within six months; but they never took place; and much soreness was the result. The Prusso-Dutch treaty, signed at Berlin on April 15, 1788,⁴⁶ served to bind together those states and to pave the way for the Triple Alliance of that year between England, Prussia and the United Provinces, which during three years gave the law to the north of Europe.

The events of 1787-1788 were therefore of far more than local

⁴⁵ F. O., France, no. 26.

⁴⁶ See Hertzberg, *Recueil*, II. 444-448; Garden, *Traité*s, V. 92-93.

interest. They consolidated the position of the House of Orange, and, though their effects vanished for a time in the whirlwind of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, yet they pointed the way to the establishment of monarchy in 1814. Far different was the outcome of affairs in France. There the old order of things tottered under the blow dealt by England and Prussia. All the world expected Louis XVI. to draw the sword; and probably he would have strengthened his position and undermined that of the Parlements had he adopted a spirited policy and aroused a national feeling. As it was, he rattled the sword in the scabbard and then issued the extraordinary *Contre-Déclaration* of October 27 that he had never intended to draw it. A more fatuous and fatal policy cannot be conceived. It was a public confession that France could not fight, even on behalf of an ally; and Napoleon afterwards named it as one of the chief causes of the French Revolution.

In truth, the court of Versailles committed every possible blunder. Its agents in Holland, notably Vêrac, encouraged the Dutch Patriots to push matters to an extreme, though Montmorin all along doubted the wisdom of going to war on their behalf. A little later he confessed to Eden his mistake in not recalling Vêrac long before the troubles came to a climax. This is perfectly true; for, as has been shown, the warlike attitude adopted by the British court on August 24 resulted solely from the aggressions of the Free Corps and the intrigues of Vêrac. Carmarthen continued to accuse Montmorin of duplicity, but he may rather be charged with weakness in not checking the actions of Ségur and in not recalling Vêrac by the spring of 1787. Whatever may be our verdict on the motives that actuated Montmorin, he certainly helped to dig the grave of the old monarchy.

British policy, on the other hand, was active, intelligent and prompt to take advantage of events. Harris played the long uphill game at the Hague with skill, boldness and tenacity. In all probability he did not suggest the journey of the Princess of Orange from Nimeguen to the Hague, though that has generally been credited to him. The evidence seems to show that it was the outcome of her daring and resourceful spirit. But Pitt and Carmarthen at once discerned the results that might accrue from that event. They awaited a favorable opportunity; and the outbreak of war in the East came just in time to clinch the long wavering purposes of the King of Prussia. There are few episodes in modern history which more easily and swiftly brought about an entirely new diplomatic situation, or from which greater results were to spring.

J. HOLLAND ROSE.

PRESIDENT LINCOLN AND THE NAVY

FROM March 4, 1861, to April 15, 1865, Abraham Lincoln was the commander-in-chief of the navy of the United States. During these years the duties of this office were more important, varied and difficult than at any other period of the history of our nation. Early in the Civil War the task of administering the navy was suddenly augmented and complicated by a large increase in the number of ships, officers and seamen, by far-reaching changes in the art of naval construction, and by the employment of the fleet in actual warfare. From 1861 to 1865 the naval ships increased from 90 to 670, the officers from 1300 to 6700, and the seamen from 7500 to 51,500. Some two hundred vessels were built either at the navy-yards by the government or at private shipyards under contract, and more than three hundred vessels were purchased. The net annual expenditures of the navy rose from \$12,000,000 to \$123,000,000.¹

During the Civil War naval architecture was in a state of transition. Iron was superseding wood as a material of construction, and steam engines were taking the place of sails as a means of propulsion. When the war began more than one-half of our naval vessels were sailing-ships; when it ended four-fifths of them were steam-ships. Many of the latter were ironclads, the modern type of war-vessel, now first introduced into our navy. Of the ironclads, not a few were monitors, the well-known invention of that distinguished engineer and naval architect, John Ericsson. The construction of naval machinery and of ordnance was rapidly improved. Nearly every variety and type of engine, valve-gear, screw-propeller and boiler were tried. A chief engineer was sent to Europe to collect information relating to steam engineering. The various kinds of coal in the seaboard states were experimented with in order to ascertain their comparative value for naval vessels. New cannon of different kinds were introduced, the largest of which were the 15-inch guns brought into use by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Gustavus V. Fox. These numerous changes in the art of naval construction greatly increased the difficulties of administration.²

¹ *Senate Ex. Doc.*, 45 Cong., 1 sess., no. 3, pp. 156-157; *House Ex. Doc.*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., no. 280; *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy*, for 1864, pp. xii-xxiv; for 1865, pp. xii-xiii; *Navy Registers*, for 1860, pp. 18-81; for 1865, pp. 12-216.

² *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy*, for 1864, p. xxix.

The naval operations of the Civil War were the most extensive ever undertaken by our navy. A blockade of the Southern States was successfully enforced, many important naval expeditions were projected and executed, numerous rivers of the South and West were actively patrolled, and the commerce-destroyers of the enemy were tracked over distant seas. At the beginning of the war the blockading of the extensive coast of the Confederacy was deemed impossible by many men both at home and abroad. To their surprise this difficult undertaking was soon accomplished. The length of the coast blockaded, measured from Alexandria, Virginia, to the Rio Grande, was 3549 miles. One hundred and eighty-nine harbors, openings to rivers, or indentations of the coast were guarded. On the Mississippi and its tributaries the gunboats traversed and patrolled 3615 miles; and on the sounds, bayous, rivers and inlets of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, about 2000 miles.³ Next in importance to the blockade, were the naval operations against the batteries, forts and fortified towns and cities on the sea-coast and rivers of the Confederacy. As examples of this class of operations, it is sufficient to mention the memorable achievements of Farragut at New Orleans, Vicksburg and Mobile, of Porter at Fort Fisher, and of Dupont and of Dahlgren at Charleston. The most important event of the war in connection with the Confederate commerce-destroyers was of course the capture of the *Alabama* by the *Kearsarge*, off Cherbourg, in June, 1864.

President Lincoln has briefly described the work of the navy in a letter written on August 26, 1863, in response to an invitation to attend a mass-meeting of "unconditional Union men", to be held at Springfield, Illinois, the President's home-town. Having referred to the achievements of the army at Antietam, Murfreesboro and Gettysburg, and on fields of lesser note, he paid his respects to its sister-service:

Nor must Uncle Sam's web-feet be forgotten. At all the watery margins they have been present. Not only on the deep sea, the broad bay, and the rapid river, but also up the narrow, muddy bayou, and wherever the ground was a little damp, they have been and made their tracks. Thanks to all.⁴

The immediate representatives of the President in naval affairs were the two leading officials of the Navy Department, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Gustavus V. Fox. These two men, with the assistance of their bureau chiefs, largely conducted the naval business of the war.

³ *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy*, for 1863, p. iii.

⁴ Nicolay and Hay, *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (Gettysburg ed.), IX. 101.

Their relations with the President were exceedingly cordial and intimate. They saw him almost daily, visited him at all hours at the White House, and discussed with him the various phases of naval policy and administration. Upon them largely depended the success or failure of the navy. Differing widely in temperament, training and experience, the two men were complementary. Each would have been weak without the other. Together they were a remarkably strong force in conducting the war. So closely were they associated with the President, and so large and predominant a part in naval affairs did they play, that no account of Lincoln and the navy would be complete without some reference to their work and character.

Gideon Welles was descended from the best stock of Connecticut. The original emigrant of his family to that state, Thomas Welles, held many important public offices between 1639 and 1659, being twice elected governor of the infant colony. Gideon was educated at the Episcopal Academy in Cheshire, Connecticut, and at the Norwich University in Vermont. He read law, and at the age of twenty-three became editor and one of the proprietors of the *Hartford Times*, which he edited until 1837. From 1827 to 1835 he was a member of the Connecticut legislature. For several years Welles served his state as comptroller of public accounts, and for some five years he was postmaster of Hartford. From 1846 to 1849 he was chief of the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing in the Navy Department at Washington.

In politics Welles was for many years a Jacksonian Democrat. His anti-slavery views carried him into the Republican party when it was organized, and in 1856 he was its candidate for governor of Connecticut. He was at that time the leading contributor to the *Hartford Evening Press*, the Republican organ of his state. For several years Welles was a member of the Republican National Committee. He was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions of 1856 and 1860, and during the presidential campaign of 1860 he labored earnestly for the election of Lincoln.⁵

In November, 1860, when Lincoln began to consider various men for places in his Cabinet, Welles's name was one of the first presented to him, and was the subject of a special consultation. Vice-President Hannibal Hamlin urged his appointment. Senator John P. Hale, a New Hampshire politician, was rather earnestly pressed upon the President for Secretary of the Navy, and he was somewhat mortified that his pretensions for the place were not more seriously regarded. Other names may have been considered for the naval

⁵ Boynton, *History of the Navy during the Great Rebellion*, I. 22-24.

portfolio. Lincoln from the first was convinced of Welles's fitness, availability and representative character.⁶

The assignment of Welles to the Navy Department instead of to some other Cabinet position may be ascribed to his three years' experience as chief of the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing, and to his residence in New England, whose maritime interests have given her a claim upon the naval secretaryship. In making up his Cabinet, Lincoln apportioned its members according to their sectional residence and their party antecedents. Welles was chosen as the New England member, and as a representative of the Democratic element of the Republican party. The Whig faction of the party was not generally friendly to him. No love was lost between Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy and his Secretary of State, William H. Seward. Thurlow Weed, one of the leaders of the Whigs in New York, was not kindly disposed towards Welles and opposed his selection for the naval secretaryship. In December, 1860, Weed said to the President that if he would on his way to his inauguration in Washington stop long enough in New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore to select an attractive figure-head from the prow of a ship, would adorn it with an elaborate wig and luxuriant whiskers, and would transfer it to the entrance of the Navy Department, this figure-head would be quite as serviceable to the navy as Welles, and much less expensive. "Oh", Mr. Lincoln replied, "wooden midshipmen answer very well in novels, but we must have a live secretary of the navy."⁷

Welles's "elaborate wig and luxuriant whiskers" gave him a patriarchal appearance, which his age and vigor of intellect belied. When he entered the Cabinet, he was in his fifty-ninth year. Secretary of State Seward and Secretary of War Cameron were older than the Secretary of the Navy, and Attorney-General Bates was ten years his senior. Among the naval officers and seamen Welles's paternal and benevolent aspect won for him the familiar appellation of "Father Welles", or the "Old Man of the Sea". Mr. Charles A. Dana, for a time an assistant of Secretary of War Stanton, has left us one of the best characterizations of Lincoln's naval secretary.

Welles was a curious-looking man: he wore a wig which was parted in the middle, the hair falling down on each side; and it was from his peculiar appearance, I have always thought, that the idea that he was an old fogey originated. I remember Governor Andrew, of Massachusetts, coming into my office at the War Department one day and asking where he could find "that old Mormon deacon, the Secretary of the Navy."

⁶ Papers of Gideon Welles, in the possession of his son Edgar T. Welles, of New York City; Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, II. 367.

⁷ Weed, *Autobiography*, I. 606-607, 611.

In spite of his peculiarities, I think Mr. Welles was a very wise, strong man. There was nothing decorative about him; there was no noise in the street when he went along; but he understood his duty, and did it efficiently, continually, and unvaryingly. There was a good deal of opposition to him, for we had no navy when the war began, and he had to create one without much deliberation; but he was patient, laborious, and intelligent at his task.⁸

Welles has sometimes been unjustly regarded as a time-serving and routine-loving executive. It is true that he was not one of those dashing administrators, who reach conclusions by intuition, put their decisions into effect with great strenuousness, and are at once the inspiration and the terror of their subordinates. Rather, he was the quiet, unswerving, fearless executive, who reasons carefully from the evidence presented and draws temperately his conclusions therefrom, who enforces his judgments with firmness and uniformity, and who gains the esteem of his fellows by reason of his patience, integrity and justice. While Welles had his antipathies, he nevertheless administered the navy as a rule with great impartiality. He applied the laws of the navy fearlessly and without favor, no matter what the rank of the offender. He stood, as few secretaries have, for naval discipline and an impartial administration of the naval code. More than once he rebuked a naval court for bringing in a verdict contrary to the evidence presented to it. A court-martial, of which Farragut was president, found the captain of a certain ship guilty of failing to do his utmost in overtaking and capturing a certain Confederate vessel, an offense punishable with death. The court sentenced the offending officer to be suspended from the navy for two years on leave-of-absence pay—a merely nominal penalty. Welles in reviewing these absurd findings pointed out that the sentence of the court would be too mild for a trivial offense, and declared that such punishment as the court had prescribed “no officer could obtain from the Department as a favor”.⁹

No man could be more generous than the Secretary of the Navy in praise of gallant and meritorious conduct. His congratulatory messages to the victorious naval officers were warm and hearty, and felicitously phrased. As a newspaper writer he had acquired considerable facility in composition. All of his writings reveal a faculty for lucid expression, clear thinking, and the discernment of the gist of any subject. His official reports are more interesting reading than are most documents of that sort. Unlike some of the naval secretaries, Welles did not depute to his subordinates the composi-

⁸ Dana, *Recollections of the Civil War*, p. 170.

⁹ *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies*, first series, vol. III., pp. 467-470.

tion of his annual reports, although he availed himself of their criticisms and suggestions. From the diary which he kept during and after the war, an unpublished document of great historical value, one infers that its author was a methodical man, painstaking and honest, and fearless and coldly precise in estimating the character and ability of his colleagues.¹⁰

In determining the policy of the government, Welles's advice was valued by the President, and his judgment was sober and well-balanced. His counsel, however, may not always have been politic. It is recollected that at the time of the Mason and Slidell episode he wrote a warmly-congratulatory letter to Captain Wilkes. That the Secretary of the Navy should have a profound knowledge of international law, was, however, hardly to be expected. Regarding the government's powers under the Constitution, Welles took a middle ground, being neither a strict nor a broad constructionist. He and the Secretary of State were instinctively opposed to each other, and were usually on opposite sides of the questions that came before the Cabinet. Welles regarded Seward as an intriguing and designing politician. He held, on plausible grounds, that Seward's conduct during the first weeks of Lincoln's administration was, if not traitorous, certainly highly unpatriotic. The Secretary of the Navy possessed none of those superb delusions that sometimes afflicted Lincoln's brilliant Secretary of State. On matters lying within the field of his information his judgment was certainly as reliable as that of his more famous colleague.

To a technical and intimate knowledge of the navy, Welles made no pretensions. He, however, was better equipped than most naval secretaries have been. His three years' service in one of the naval bureaus had given him a considerable acquaintance with the business of the navy and the department. Fortunately, the limitations of Welles's naval knowledge were adequately compensated by the extensive professional information of his Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Gustavus V. Fox, whose selection by President Lincoln as Welles's assistant was a most happy one.

At the beginning of the war Fox was in his fortieth year. He was born in Saugus, Essex County, Massachusetts. His father was a country physician, in moderate circumstances. At the age of sixteen young Fox was appointed a midshipman in the navy, where he remained for eighteen years. During a varied career he saw service in the squadrons of the Mediterranean, the East Indies, the Pacific, the coast of Brazil and the west coast of Africa; and he participated in the naval operations of the Mexican War. For a time he was

¹⁰ Diary of Gideon Welles, in possession of Edgar T. Welles.

attached to the Coast Survey. In 1853 and 1854 he commanded a mail steamer plying between New York and the Isthmus of Panama and belonging to one of the three lines subsidized at that time by the United States government. In July, 1856, having reached the rank of lieutenant, he resigned from the navy and accepted the position of "agent" of the Bay State Woolen Mills, of Lawrence, Massachusetts. Early in 1861, he came to Washington with a plan for the relief of Fort Sumter, and in April President Lincoln permitted him to put it into operation. In planning, promoting and conducting this daring adventure, he displayed such energy and initiative that the President formed a high estimate of his character. The Fort Sumter expedition paved the way to his political preferment. On May 9, 1861, he was appointed chief clerk of the Navy Department, and on July 31 he was promoted to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a newly-created position.¹¹

Fox's career both in and out of the navy admirably fitted him for the assistant secretaryship. His long service in the navy gave him a wide acquaintance among the naval officers. He had acquired the habit of the navy and of the sea, and knew well the practice of the naval profession. On the other hand, his experience as a New England manufacturer had familiarized him with the currents of thought and action outside of the navy; with the methods of business, its economies and administration, and the qualities of commercial men. In the science of the naval profession, in contradistinction to its art, Fox was not specially well-grounded. His knowledge of naval architecture was naturally limited, and his strategy proved to be at times faulty. To Rear-Admiral C. H. Davis he appeared more ready to plan, than laboriously to execute. Fox was decisive, quick of mind, and self-confident. No matter how dark and gloomy were the prospects of the North, the buoyancy of his spirits never failed him. Urbane and suave, the amenities of social life came easy to him. His brother-in-law was Lincoln's Postmaster-General, Montgomery Blair. Few men, who in the eventful spring of 1861 came to the surface of that tempestuous political sea at Washington, were so likely as Gustavus V. Fox to survive in its rough waters and ride its waves to preferment and eminence.¹²

Both the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy had a great capacity for work, and each wrote with his own hands a vast number of letters. To their subordinates they often appeared fatigued and overworked. Night after night they toiled over their

¹¹ Biographical details in Boynton, *History of the Navy during the Great Rebellion*, pp. 58-59.

¹² Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, V. 4-5; Davis, *Life of Charles Henry Davis*, pp. 132-133.

desks at the department. In the course of his duties Fox now and then visited the navy-yards or some of the principal seaports of the North. Infrequently, Welles or his assistant went to the "front", the latter more often than the former. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy witnessed the fight at Hampton Roads, in March, 1862, between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*. In May of that year the Secretary of the Navy invited two or three members of the Cabinet, the chief clerk of the department, and several naval officers with the ladies of their families to make a special cruise on the steamer *City of Baltimore* and visit the Union fleets between Washington and Richmond. Such excursions must have brought to the Secretary and his assistant a welcome relief from the anxieties, vexations and arduous toil of their offices.

Throughout the war Lincoln's gaunt form was a familiar figure in the Old Navy Department Building, situated a stone's throw to the westward of the White House. The rooms of Welles and Fox were on the second floor, in easy reach of each other. Here the President often called and chatted in the most informal way. A clerk, who is still living, remembers seeing him appear in the department with "carpet slippers" on his feet. Sometimes he wore a shawl around his shoulders. Of a visit of Lincoln to the department made in April, 1863, Rear-Admiral Dahlgren writes: "The President came into Fox's room while I was there, and sat some time, talking generally of matters. . . . Abe was in good humor, and at leaving said, 'Well I will go home; I had no business here; but as the lawyer said, I had none anywhere else'."¹³

The following entry occurs in the diary of Dahlgren for March 29, 1863:

I went to the Department. Found the President in the Chief Clerk's room with the Secretary and Fox. He looks thin and badly, and is very nervous. Complained of everything. They were doing nothing at Vicksburg or Charleston. Dupont was asking for one iron-clad after another, as fast as they were built. He said the canal at Vicksburg was of no account, and wondered that a sensible man would do it. I tried my hand at consolation, without much avail. He thought the favorable state of public expectation would pass away before anything was done. Then levelled a couple of jokes at the doings at Vicksburg and Charleston. Poor gentleman!¹⁴

Lincoln kept in close touch with the navy. Almost every day, and often several times a day, he consulted with the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the officials of the naval bureaus, and the officers holding important commands. Of these, the most frequent visitor at the White House was the Assistant Secretary, to whom fell,

¹³ Dahlgren, *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren*, p. 390.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 389.

among many other duties, that of obtaining from Congress proper naval legislation. Whenever the leading naval officers were in Washington they always called upon the President and found him an eager listener to all that they had to relate about their plans and operations. Chief among the President's naval advisers were Farragut, Porter, Dahlgren, Dupont, Davis, Foote and Wise. In the conferences on naval affairs Lincoln took an active part, and as a result of them he often reached a decision or issued an order. As no minutes of them were kept, it is impossible in most cases to determine precisely what was said or done. The voluminous papers of Welles and Fox, only a small part of which was accessible to me, will doubtless throw some additional light upon the President's achievements in naval administration.

The planning of the naval operations was largely a composite work. Lincoln's share in it was confined for the most part to criticisms and suggestions respecting the plans formulated by others. As to naval movements upon the Mississippi, however, he seems to have had original opinions of his own, derived doubtless from his early experiences as a flatboatman on that river. In the summer of 1861 the Commission of Conference, composed chiefly of naval officers, served as a board of strategy. The commanding officers often originated their own plans, and the Assistant Secretary was always fertile in suggestions respecting naval operations. In all co-operative movements with the army, much consultation took place between the officers of the army and the navy, the officials of the two departments, and the President.

As a rule, the orders to the officers were drafted in the Navy Department and were issued and signed by either Welles or Fox. Sometimes, however, when the need of action was very great, the President himself wrote or dictated orders. For instance, in April, 1863, when Admiral Dupont was operating against Charleston, South Carolina, Lincoln, fearing that the admiral was about to abandon the movement against the city, telegraphed him to hold his position "inside the bar near Charleston".¹⁵ Before the telegram reached him Dupont had withdrawn his ships from the bar. He regarded it as a reflection upon his management of the fleet, and he soon retired from the command of the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron. It was unusual for the President to interfere in this manner with the work of his officers.

Early in 1862 Commodore Foote, who was then in command of the Mississippi flotilla and had his headquarters at Cairo, Illinois, encountered many difficulties in procuring mortars at Pittsburgh.

¹⁵ *Official Records*, first series, vol. XIV., p. 132.

Much exasperated by the slowness with which the work proceeded, the President ordered Foote to telegraph daily to Captain H. A. Wise, the assistant inspector of naval ordnance at Washington, his progress in obtaining the mortars. For several weeks Wise went to the White House every day, read the telegrams to the President, and received orders for Foote. In this way Lincoln conducted a small part of the business of the navy independent of both Welles and Fox. "With reference to the mortar rafts", Wise wrote to Foote on January 27, 1862, "Uncle Abe, as you already know, has gone into that business with a will, making his first demonstration, *entre nous*, by pitching General Ripley out of his Ordnance Bureau." On January 31 Wise wrote of the President thus, "He is an evidently practical man, understands precisely what he wants, and is not turned aside by anyone when he has his work before him."¹⁶

In selecting officers for the higher commands Lincoln generally followed the advice of the department. Admiral Porter, however, was of the opinion that the President selected him to command the Mississippi squadron, in opposition to the wishes of Welles. Porter said that Lincoln seemed to be familiar with the name, character and reputation of every officer of rank in the army and navy, and "appeared to understand them better than some whose business it was to do so; he had many a good story to tell of nearly all, and if he could have lived to write the anecdotes of the war, I am sure he would have furnished the most readable book of the century".¹⁷

The Navy Department was conspicuously successful in selecting officers for the higher commands. Its good fortune in this respect as compared with the bad fortune of the War Department was commented upon by President Lincoln. He once said to Welles that the qualities of the officers of the navy must run more even, and the task of selecting officers for the higher commands must be less difficult, than in the army. The Secretary of the Navy assured the President that this was not true, and that the good fortune of the navy in choosing commanders had resulted from the wise judgment exercised by his department.¹⁸ It is a fact that the Navy Department did no experimenting corresponding with that of the War Department with McClellan, Halleck, Hooker and Pope. Before the end of 1862 the navy officers who achieved fame had already received the highest position within the gift of the President. Even at this early date the roll of great naval names could have been made out—Farragut, Porter, Foote, Davis, Dahlgren, Rodgers and Lee.

¹⁶ *Official Records*, first series, vol XXII., pp. 516, 518, 522, 523, 527, 549.

¹⁷ Porter, *Incidents and Anecdotes of the Civil War*, p. 283.

¹⁸ Papers of Gideon Welles, in possession of Edgar T. Welles.

When Lincoln and Welles entered upon their duties in March, 1861, they found the Navy Department and the navy in a deplorable condition. Many of the clerks of the department were hostile to the new Secretary of the Navy. The disaffected naval officers on duty at the department maintained a rallying-point in the Bureau of Ordnance, whose chief, Captain George A. Magruder, and whose clerks, almost to a man, later allied themselves with the Confederacy. The Naval Observatory in Washington, under the command of Commander Matthew F. Maury, the famous meteorologist, and a warm friend of the South, was another centre for the propagation of Secessionist doctrines. The officers of the navy were more or less demoralized. Already a number of them had resigned, and many of those that remained in the service were suspected of disaffection to the Union. Captain Samuel Barron, one of the leaders of a clique of Southern officers, who were favorable to the interests of the Confederacy, was exercising a considerable influence on naval affairs. It was impossible for Welles to tell his friends from his foes. The Pensacola navy-yard was in the hands of the Confederates. The situation at the Norfolk yard was by no means reassuring, and among the officers of the Washington yard sentiments of disloyalty were common. All the navy-yards were in bad repair, since no appropriations for their improvement had been made in 1859 or 1860. The national treasury was bankrupt. In pursuance of President Buchanan's policy of non-resistance and temporizing, Secretary of the Navy Toucey had failed to place the navy in a posture of defense. As was customary in peace, most of the vessels in commission were on foreign stations. The home-squadron consisted of twelve ships, carrying one hundred and eighty-seven guns and about two thousand men.

A sharp turn in naval policy might have been expected to signalize the advent of the new administration. The public records, however, disclose no sudden change of any sort. For the first three weeks Welles did almost nothing to increase or improve the naval defense of the country, and for the second three weeks he did little. In the first days of April he prepared an expedition for the relief of Fort Sumter, and opened several rendezvous for the enlistment of seamen. Until the firing on Fort Sumter the policy of Lincoln differed but little from that of Buchanan. It was one of conciliation and waiting; it was passive, hesitant, expectant, uncertain, cautious and tentative. Lincoln and the members of his Cabinet were not familiar with federal administration, nor with each other; and at first they did not pull well together. They were strangely awkward at their new work, how awkward it is painful to tell. The

attempts of the Secretary of State to manage the government and the President are well known.

Seward's influence on naval affairs greatly added to the confusion of the first weeks of the new administration. On April 1, without consulting the Secretary of the Navy, he obtained Lincoln's signature to a most remarkable naval document. It was addressed to Welles. The body of the document was in the handwriting of Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, of the army; and the postscript in that of Lieutenant David D. Porter, of the navy. The body of the document was an order of Lincoln to Welles to make certain details of naval officers. Of special significance was the direction to Welles to detach Captain Silas H. Stringham from the Secretary's office, to order him to Pensacola, and to supersede him as detailing officer of the department by Captain Samuel Barron. The postscript, which related to the organization of the department, read as follows:

As it is very necessary at this time to have a perfect knowledge of the personal of the navy, and to be able to detail such officers for special purposes as the exigencies of the service may require, I request that you will instruct Captain Barron to proceed and organize the Bureau of Detail in the manner best adapted to meet the wants of the navy, taking cognizance of the discipline of the navy generally, detailing all officers for duty, taking charge of the recruiting of seamen, supervising charges made against officers, and all matters relating to duties which must be best understood by a sea officer. You will please afford Captain Barron any facility for accomplishing this duty, transferring to his department the clerical force heretofore used for the purposes specified. It is to be understood that this officer will act by authority of the Secretary of the Navy, who will exercise such supervision as he may deem necessary.¹⁹

These orders went far towards supplanting Welles as Secretary of the Navy by Barron. In the management of the department they made the naval officer the more important official. Upon receiving them, Welles was greatly astonished; and he immediately, on the night of April 1, carried them to the White House for an explanation. Lincoln was much surprised to find that he had signed a document of such import. He said that Seward, with two or three young men, had been at the White House during the day on a matter which the Secretary of State had much at heart; and that he had signed the document without reading it or knowing what it was, supposing that it related to an enterprise of Seward. Welles told the President that he had no confidence in the fidelity of Barron, who was by the order forced into an official and personal intimacy with him and who was virtually given charge of the department;

¹⁹ *The Galaxy*, vol. X. (1870), p. 624.

that the establishment of a bureau by executive order was unlawful; and that the proposition to make a naval officer secretary of the navy *de facto* was illegal and in his view "monstrous". Lincoln replied that he knew nothing of Barron, that the document was not his although he had signed it, and that Welles should treat it as cancelled. He expressed regret that he had blundered, and was wont afterwards to say that during the first weeks of his administration he and the members of his Cabinet were all new to their work and naturally made mistakes. Welles believed that the attempt of Seward and Porter to place the principal business of the department in the hands of Barron was a movement in behalf of the Confederacy and the Southern naval officers. Barron was shortly dismissed from the naval service. He entered the Confederate navy, taking rank as captain from March 26, 1861, five days before the date of the executive order giving him charge of the federal Navy Department.²⁰

Seward's interference with the department was not confined to measures for its reorganization and to the detailing of naval officers. He planned a naval expedition for the relief of Fort Pickens, Florida, which was officered and fitted out and had sailed before Welles got wind of it. This was the enterprise to which Lincoln supposed the above-mentioned document related when he signed it. On April 1 Seward had obtained Lincoln's signature to a second document, ordering Lieutenant Porter to proceed to the New York navy-yard and prepare an expedition for the relief of Fort Pickens. At this time Welles was fitting out at the New York navy-yard an expedition for the relief of Fort Sumter, which was to be under the command of Gustavus V. Fox. Both Welles and Seward intended that the ship *Powhatan* should sail as one of the vessels of their respective fleets. It therefore happened that the orders respecting her conflicted. The commandant of the New York yard was naturally confused. Since the President's orders were superior to those of the Secretary of the Navy, he gave Porter possession of the vessel. Welles was completely in the dark as to Porter's movements until about the time that Porter's fleet sailed from New York for Fort Pickens on April 6. On receiving intelligence of them, he in company with Seward, went to the White House and asked for an explanation of the diverting of the *Powhatan* from the Fort Sumter expedition, which venture, he said, would fail if this ship was taken from Fox's fleet. Lincoln, after explaining that he had confused the name of the *Powhatan* with that of another ship, decided that Porter should turn the vessel

²⁰ *The Galaxy*, vol. X. (1870), pp. 624-626.

over to Fox. An order to this effect was signed by Seward and sent to Porter at New York, but he had already sailed. A tug was procured, and the orders reached him before he got to sea. He however declined to detach the *Powhatan* from his fleet on the ground that he was acting under orders signed by the President, while the countermanding orders were signed by the President's subordinate, the Secretary of State. The *Powhatan* therefore proceeded to Fort Pickens. Welles and Fox always maintained that the sending of Porter's expedition was one of the main causes of the failure of Fox's.²¹

Porter cannot be freed from all blame for the part that he played in these strange proceedings. He was a man of mature years and long experience in the navy. The postscript of one of the documents was in his handwriting. Knowing well the routine of the department, he must have been aware of the irregularity of Seward's acts, and he must have foreseen that they would likely cause confusion. One might suppose that he had some knowledge of the character of Barron and of that officer's unfitness for the management of the navy during the crisis of the spring of 1861. On the other hand, it may be said in Porter's favor that he was acting under his superiors, the President and the Secretary of State, and that under the extraordinary circumstances that then existed irregularities were to be expected.²² When he accepted the command of the Fort Pickens expedition, he was under orders to proceed to the Pacific Coast and report for duty on the Coast Survey, a detail which he had sought. Welles did not forget the part that Porter played in Seward's machinations. That he did not permit it to prevent the advancement of that gallant and ambitious officer is a tribute to his fairness.

In retrospect, one can now see that during the first months of Lincoln's administration no matter deserved more consideration than the holding and defending of the Norfolk navy-yard, one of the three principal navy-yards of the United States. It contained numerous dwellings, sheds, storehouses and machine shops. Here were large quantities of tools, machines, naval stores and provisions, and some two thousand pieces of artillery. Connected with the yard was a commodious dry dock constructed of granite, and near it were twelve ships. One of these, the *Merrimac*, when equipped for sea, was worth \$1,200,000. The total value of the yard and its property was estimated by the department at \$9,780,000. The Nor-

²¹ *The Galaxy*, vol. X. (1870), pp. 627, 637; vol. XI. (1871), pp. 105-107; *Official Records*, first series, vol. IV., pp. 228-241.

²² Soley, *Admiral Porter*, pp. 101-102.

folk yard was strategically situated for the use of either the Unionists or the Confederates. To the latter, at the beginning of the war, its ordnance stores were worth far more than their value in money. These facts did not receive the consideration that they deserved. It is not here urged that the President should have provided for the defense of this yard without regard to his general policy, but certainly he should not have formulated his general policy without regard to its effect upon the holding of the yard.

During the first weeks of his administration Lincoln's policy was to do nothing that might offend those Southern states that still remained in the Union. He was especially considerate of the feelings of the Virginians. While some slight measures of defense were taken late in March and early in April, 1861, not until about the time that the Old Dominion seceded from the Union was any vigor and decision respecting the Norfolk yard shown by the administration. On April 16 Welles ordered Commodore Hiram Paulding to proceed from Washington to Norfolk and consult with the commandant of the yard, Captain C. S. McCauley, about its defense and the protection of its ships. Paulding carried an order to McCauley that rang with true mettle, the first issued by the department for several months of which this may be said. "The vessels and stores under your charge", the order read, "you will defend at any hazard, repelling by force, if necessary, any and all attempts to seize them, whether by mob violence, authorized effort, or any assumed authority." During the next four days the department showed considerable activity, but unfortunately its efforts were too late. McCauley and Paulding, who were in positions of authority, did not rise to the occasion. They were too old, too long schooled in routine, to accomplish great things in a sudden emergency. McCauley lacked energy and initiative, and he was largely under the influence of his disaffected officers, who were Southerners and who did their utmost to deceive him as to the real situation of the yard. On April 20, fearing an attack on the ships, he ordered them to be scuttled. They were sinking when Paulding arrived from Washington with fresh orders. The two officers now decided not to attempt a defense, but to destroy all the public property and to abandon the navy-yard. Their work of destruction, however, was hasty and ill-executed, and much property fell into the hands of the Confederates.

Possession of the Norfolk navy-yard with its valuable supplies was of great service to the South. Its cannon were used in fortifying the forts and batteries of the Confederacy on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and on the Potomac, York, James, Rappahannock, and Mississippi rivers. The *Merrimac* was raised and converted into a

terrible engine of war. Its dramatic contest with the *Monitor* made its name famous. The dry dock was but little injured. Many of the workshops with their valuable machinery escaped harm. Admiral Porter said that "but for the misfortune of losing, or we may say throwing away, the Norfolk Navy Yard, all the unarmed ports of the South would have easily fallen into our hands".²³

With no other naval officer was Lincoln so intimate as with Rear-Admiral John A. Dahlgren, who early in the war was commandant of the Washington navy-yard, and later was chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. For many years before the outbreak of the war Dahlgren had been in charge of the Ordnance Department of the Washington yard. He was the chief ordnance expert of the Old Navy, and had invented the Dahlgren gun. The friendship between him and the President was established during the first months of the war when the Washington navy-yard was the chief defense of the capital. In the latter part of April, 1861, almost all of the officers of this yard, including its commandant, Captain Franklin Buchanan, resigned from the navy, and most of them cast in their lot with the Confederacy. Dahlgren almost alone remained faithful to the flag, and he was given command of the yard. Later, when some of the higher officers of the navy wished to displace him and obtain his position, Lincoln refused them, saying that it should not be taken from Dahlgren, that he had held it when no one else would, and that he should keep it as long as he wished. During the first two years of the war the President visited the yard almost every week. He would take Dahlgren to ride with him, invite him to the White House to dine, and seek his advice upon naval matters. Often the two men were together during short voyages which Lincoln now and then made down the Potomac on one of the naval vessels. When the news reached Washington on Sunday morning, March 9, 1862, that the *Merrimac* had destroyed the *Cumberland* and the *Congress*, and that she might next move upon Washington or one of the Northern ports, the President was excited; he could not be satisfied with the opinions of Welles and other civilian advisers, but ordered his carriage and drove to the navy-yard to consult its commandant.²⁴

The diary of Dahlgren, for the years 1861-1863, is exceedingly interesting and valuable because of his close association with Lincoln during that period. From its pages one may glean much informa-

²³ *The Galaxy*, vol. X. (1870), pp. 112-119; *Senate Reports*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., no. 37, pp. 1-123; *Official Records*, first series, vol. IV., pp. 272-313; Sands, *From Reefer to Rear Admiral*, pp. 225-229; Porter, *The Naval History of the Civil War*, p. 62; Parker, *Recollections of a Naval Officer*, pp. 206-207.

²⁴ Dahlgren, *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren*, p. 358.

tion regarding Lincoln's propensity for joking, the tragedy of his life during the war, his love of good reading, and his careless informality of manners. How the conflict between the States exhausted him and wore his heart away is painfully clear from such sentences as these: "Poor gentleman, how thin and wasted he is"; "I observe the President never jokes now"; "He looks thin and badly, and is very nervous"; "Mr. Lincoln frequently passed sleepless nights." Often, however, the President was in good spirits and would "let off a joke". On the trips down the Potomac he was usually jolly and full of anecdotes. Regarding one of these voyages Dahlgren writes: "Meanwhile we had a gay evening in the little cabin, and then went to bed. Five of us stowed away in a place like a box! The President in his usual way, and telling many a joke." Sometimes on these trips the President would read aloud to the assembled officers and officials some favorite piece of literature. He is said to have read with much dramatic power, and with much pathos or humor according to the character of the selection. His choice on one occasion was Halleck's spirited lyric, *Marco Bozzaris*, the closing lines of which have been thought prophetic of Lincoln's own career and fate:

"For thou art Freedom's now, and Fame's;
One of the few, the immortal names,
That were not born to die."²⁵

When the war began, Lincoln was entirely ignorant of military and naval affairs, but before its close he had acquired a considerable knowledge of them. He was especially interested in ordnance and ammunition. A resident of Washington tells me that he has seen the President in the White Lot firing at a target with a Spencer gun. The diary of Dahlgren contains many references to Lincoln in connection with naval ordnance. On one day he drives to the navy-yard with Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox to see a 150-pounder fired off; shortly he comes down with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury and examines "guns, iron plates, etc."; next, he goes to the Bureau of Ordnance "to see about some new powder". On January 29, 1863, Dahlgren records that the President sent for him. "Some man in trouble about arms. President holding a breech-loader in his hand." On February 16 Dahlgren is again sent for: "Some inflammable humbug had been poked at him; from it he went off easily to Charleston matters. Dupont and Fox differ as to plan of attack, and he insists on Fox going down to Charleston to talk it over." On April 28 Dahlgren

²⁵ Dahlgren, *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren*, pp. 364. 368.

writes thus: "The President came down in the afternoon, to learn about Ames, one of the hunters for a heavy ordnance contract. It is unfortunate that the President will meddle in such matters. No adventure on the Treasury now stands on its merits. Projects for new cannon, new powder, and devices of all kinds are backed by the highest influences."²⁶

Dahlgren's account of a visit to the White House on December 22, 1862, affords an excellent view of the variety and vexation of Lincoln's tasks:

The President sent for me about ten. Entering his cabinet room, Forney, Secretary of Senate, was in conversation with him, and saying that it would be well to publish report of committee on fight at Frederick, as the people were excited.

The President answered warmly, "that he did not want to swear, but why will people be such damned fools?" Forney remarked, going, "that he hoped the President would not let Mr. Chase resign", and added, "nor Mr. Seward". The President paused and reddened, then said suddenly, "If one goes, the other must; they must hunt in couples." So Forney made his bow.

The President, much glad to drop such troublesome business, and relaxing into his usual humor, sat down and said, "Well, Captain, here's a letter about a new powder", which he read, and showed the sample. Said he had burned some, and there was too much residuum. "Now, I'll show you." He got a small sheet of paper, placed on it some of the powder, ran to the fire, and with the tongs picked up a coal, which he blew, specs still on nose. It occurred to me how peaceful was his mind, so easily diverted from the great convulsion going on, and a nation menaced with disruption.

The President clapped the coal to the powder and away it went, he remarking, "There is too much left there." He handed me a small parcel of the powder to try, and, in noticing the late imbroglio, said, "it was very well to talk of remodelling the Cabinet, but the caucus had thought more of *their* plans than of *his* benefit", and he had told them so.²⁷

The President's interest in naval details was by no means confined to arms and ammunition. On September 15, 1861, Dahlgren writes: "Last night Professor Way took his electro-mercury light down the river, and I had the President out in a steamboat to see it." Several months later the same authority records that the President came down to the navy-yard to look at "some invention". Lincoln often inspected the vessels of the navy that visited Washington or Alexandria. Rear-Admiral Daniel Ammen relates that on one occasion when the President, in company with Dahlgren and Thurlow Weed, was passing Alexandria on board the *Philadelphia*, he happened to see our war-ship *Pawnee* abreast the wharf. On

²⁶ Dahlgren, *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren*, pp. 386, 388, 390-391.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 383-384.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—20.

hearing her name he asked if she were not the vessel with the "curious bottom having bilges coming down below the line of the keel, and then drew roughly on the marble top of a table, with a lead-pencil, a cross-section of the vessel, and asked Dahlgren whether the bottom was not something like that, and on receiving an affirmative answer he made one of the humorous comparisons for which he was famous".²⁸

Several naval officers who saw much of the President during the war have left us their impressions of him and their estimates of his character. Shortly after Lincoln's death, Dahlgren wrote: "I can say, from an intimate acquaintance with the President, that he was a man of rare sagacity, good genial temper, and desirable firmness; that he possessed qualities of the highest order as a ruler; indeed, we know of no man who was so well fitted to carry the country through her trial."²⁹

On several occasions Admiral Porter had good opportunities for observing the President. Early in 1865, a few weeks before the war ended, Lincoln spent several days with him on board of his flagship *Malvern*, on the James River. Porter was impressed with the kindness of heart, the habit of story-telling, and the unassuming simplicity of his distinguished visitor. Long after the war he wrote of Lincoln as follows:

To me, he was one of the most interesting men I ever met. He had an originality about him which was peculiarly his own, and one felt when with him as if he could confide his dearest secret to him with absolute security against its betrayal. There, it might be said, was "God's noblest work—an honest man", and such he was all through. I have not a particle of the bump of veneration on my head, but I saw more to admire in this man, more to reverence, than I had believed possible. He had a load to bear that few men could carry, yet he traveled on with it, footsore and weary, but without complaint; rather, on the contrary, cheering those who would faint on the roadside. He was not a demonstrative man, so no one will ever know amid all the trials he underwent how much he had to contend with and how often he was called upon to sacrifice his own opinions to those of others who he felt did not know as much about matters at issue as he did himself. When he did surrender, it was always with a pleasant manner, winding up with a characteristic story.³⁰

Rear-Admiral C. H. Davis was for the larger part of the war attached to the Navy Department, in Washington. He was an officer of cultivated mind and acute observation. His descriptions of the President are especially valuable since they were penned with-

²⁸ Dahlgren, *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren*, pp. 343, 378; Ammen, *The Old Navy and the New*, p. 341.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 509.

³⁰ Soley, *Admiral Porter*, pp. 445-446.

out view to their publication and before the Lincoln tradition had more or less obscured the real man. The following words, written on March 9, 1861, give Davis's first impressions:

Yesterday morning, Friday, I set off early for the department, in and about which I passed the day. I found that the officers of the navy were to be formally received by the Secretary and President, and being in uniform (though the others were in full dress), I fell in and had the pleasure of seeing the President and Mrs. Lincoln. In the former I was agreeably disappointed. His likenesses, such as are seen in prints, etc., give no idea of his appearance,—I might almost say, none whatever. His countenance is far from ugly, and its expression is decidedly attractive. The play of features and the easy smile are more engaging than the pictures make him. He is awkward in his figure and manners, but his awkwardness is not *gaucherie*. It is by no means vulgar. The impression he makes is altogether favorable.⁸¹

In a letter of December 13, 1863, apparently to his wife, Davis wrote the following prophetic words:

You may be assured that in future times Lincoln will be regarded as the very greatest of all the blessings bestowed on this country in these sad times,—as God-sent, appointed by God, like the prophets of old, to do his work, to save the nation and regenerate the people, to remove the curse of slavery, and to set another example of the profound wisdom that lies hidden and unrevealed in simplicity, truthfulness, uprightness before God, humility, conscientiousness, even when unaccompanied with great talents or great learning: In his and similar examples consists the political life of the nation and its safety,—the safety of our republican institutions.⁸²

CHARLES OSCAR PAULLIN.

⁸¹ Davis, *Life of Charles Henry Davis*, pp. 114–115.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 301.

DOCUMENTS

Letters of General Thomas Williams, 1862.

THE following letters have several claims to special interest. They are continuous in character, they describe important phases of Civil War experience, and they were written by a man not only exceedingly expert in military science but who was a wonderfully pure and patriotic character. Perhaps a brief synopsis of his career should introduce the letters, as, while he enjoyed a very great professional fame among those best qualified to judge, he was not widely known nor well understood by the public.

Thomas Williams was born at Albany, New York, January 16, 1815. His father, Captain John R. Williams, was a native and well-known citizen of Detroit, in the Territory of Michigan, who was temporarily residing in Albany on account of the War of 1812, having been made prisoner in Hull's surrender, and paroled. John R. Williams returned to Detroit in 1816, where his son Thomas received his early education. The youth showed his first military bias in the Black Hawk War, where he served as a trumpeter, his father being in command of a division of Michigan troops. This determined his future career, and he was admitted to West Point in 1833 as a cadet, graduating in 1837 with Hooker, Sedgwick, Van Dorn and other generals of the Civil War.

His field service began immediately on graduation as second lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery, in the closing campaigns of the Florida War. In 1839 he was in instruction camp at Trenton, New Jersey, shortly afterward at Detroit, and then instructor at West Point. He went to the Mexican War as first lieutenant and aide-de-camp to General Scott, beginning with the siege of Vera Cruz, where he had charge of a battery. He was in all the heavy actions which followed in the advance to Mexico and the siege and capture of the city, except Molino del Rey, and was brevetted both captain and major for gallant and meritorious conduct. He became captain, Fourth Artillery, in 1850, serving at Fort Columbus, New York Harbor, and took command at Fort Mackinac in 1852. While there he was married to Miss Mary Neosho Bailey, daughter of Dr. Joseph H. Bailey, U.S.A., and to her these letters were written. The wife

was fully able to enter into the military tone of the letters, as she grew up in an atmosphere of such affairs.

In 1856 Major Williams joined General Harney's Florida expedition and spent a year or more in the Everglades, or their neighborhood, a very trying service. Then he was transferred to Leavenworth, and began early in 1858 a long march across the plains in support of Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston's Utah expedition. Reaching Laramie, he found that Johnston had already been successful, and so went into camp for the winter at the Cheyenne Pass, now in Wyoming. Then followed another long march to Fort Randall on the Upper Missouri, and then a short leave.

Major Williams returned to duty in April, 1860, and spent the trying year that followed at Fort Monroe, Virginia, engaged in the Artillery School. During the opening months of the Civil War he was occupied with recruiting the new Fifth Artillery and with duties of inspection, there and in Pennsylvania, and with the instruction of volunteers at Harrisburg. His commission as major in the new Fifth came in June, 1861, and that of brigadier-general of volunteers in September. From October, 1861, to the beginning of March, 1862, he was in command at Hatteras Inlet. He was then assigned to General Butler's Mississippi expedition. The letters here printed begin with the arrival of that expedition in the neighborhood of Ship Island.

Subsequent events can be learned fairly well from the letters. The few days preceding his death, which are not described in the letters, may be filled in by saying that he was constantly on the alert against an expected attack, but always calm and a tower of strength to his men, who never ceased to marvel at his coolness in danger. On Sunday, August 3, 1862, he received the Holy Communion in the Episcopal church in Baton Rouge. On Monday evening he took all his field officers and battery commanders around his position and over the field of the impending conflict. By four o'clock the following morning his little force of invalids was engaged in a desperate struggle with two divisions of the Confederate Army, whose attacks continued until after ten o'clock. The fighting was exceedingly heavy and at close range, and severe losses were suffered among the ranking officers of the Confederate Army.

General Williams entered the action with a hastily improvised staff, as his own selected staff, all but one, were dead or absent on account of sickness. He was forced therefore to be often exposed, and after losing two horses shot under him was himself killed, leading the Twenty-first Indiana Regiment in a bayonet charge. The

odds against him had been so severe that it is no small glory that he held the town and saved his small command.

He had an extraordinary devotion to discipline as the ground of a soldier's character, and many, especially among the volunteers, had thought him too severe. But he was himself most rigorously disciplined, and those whom he had trained certainly afterward thoroughly justified their teacher and leader. With all this, his heart was extraordinarily kind, and his manners so gracious and courtly that old people speak of him to this day as the fine flower of chivalry.

The South had few good words to say of many of our leaders, but it has recorded in its histories that it greatly respected and admired him for his virtues and his humanity. His own commander described him in General Orders as "the true friend, the gallant gentleman, the pure patriot and victorious hero, and the devoted Christian. All and more went out when Williams died. . . . His virtues we cannot exceed; his example we may emulate."

General Williams was survived by a widow and four children. The youngest son soon followed him. The rest are still living.¹

The letters have been very slightly abridged by omissions, which are marked. Matters of purely family interest were often too trivial and sometimes too sacred for publication.

G. MOTT WILLIAMS.

March 12, 1862. Transport *Constitution*, at sea.

This is our 6th day out from Ft. Monroe, and we think ourselves at this writing three hours from Ship Island, our supposed destination. The supposition will probably be changed into certainty, should I meet Gen'l Butler, as I expect to, at Ship Island. Ship Island is east and north of the mouth of the Mississippi, between New Orleans and Mobile. We have already a force of about 4000 men at Ship Island, and my force on board of this ship is about 3000. What additional force Gen'l Butler may have with him we are not informed. We learn, however, from rumour, that the entire force of his expedition numbers 15,000, which force will probably be divided into three brigades of 5000 each. Gen. Phelps to command one brigade, myself another, and who will command the third I don't know. The trip thus far has been rapid and agreeable. A succession of so many days of clear sky and smooth sea as we have had is not common. And then, the temperature, that of late spring or summer. Too hot yesterday for winter clothing. The shower of last night and the early morning has however cooled the air to about 70—very pleasant. I can hardly imagine a finer ship than this. So large, well furnished, so swift and so well provided with creature comforts. Perfectly clean, for this is only her third trip since she was launched and every department complete—pantry, store rooms, ice

¹To one of General Williams's sons, the Bishop of Marquette, we are indebted for permission to print these letters.—Ed.

house, kitchen, etc. She cost \$460,000 and receives from Gov't \$2500 a day for carrying troops, feeding the officers and providing the men with coffee, morning and night, and cooking their rations. The table cloths and knives and forks clean and white: and my table for self and staff a separate one, as good as any man could wish. An asst Adj. Gen'l, a surgeon, a qrmaster, a commissary and two aides de camp, a topographical officer, Lt. Turnbull of the army, on his way to join Gen. Butler, is also of our table.

The men are of better quality physically than any I have yet seen, and the officers highly respectable. Thus far, in this calamitous war, our western regiments are the only ones which have shown any proper spirit in the fight, and with the right spirit they, no doubt, excel the eastern regiments in knowledge of arms and aptitude for war. I hope Gen'l Butler will permanently assign those with me to my brigade. I understand, they desire it themselves. It is a coincidence, is it not, that I, a western man, ordered from a sand spit on the Hatteras coast to a sand spit near the mouth of the Mississippi should meet with and take command of the only western reg'ts assigned to the Expedition. I hope it promises good fortune. Success for me with western troops would have a completeness, it seems to me, that it could not have with eastern. But, with all supposed auxiliaries in men and material, I yet look to the blessing of Providence, and count on no success without. I ask His blessing morning and night; and depend not a little on the prayers of my wife. If I ever doubted the efficacy of prayer, I no longer doubt. The greatest results in war, as in the general affairs of nations are in His hand, and the greatest and best and bravest men have been accustomed to invoke his help.

15 min. to 6 P. M. We have arrived at Ship Island and I've just returned from shore, having selected a camping ground for the three regts. The place is not unlike Hatteras. Gen Butler not arrived. I shall commence to disembark early tomorrow morning.

March 12, 9.15 P. M. Steamship *Constitution*, OFF SHIP ISLAND.

Hatteras Island is as like Ship Island as two peas, and coming from one to the other reminds me of the saying of jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. But Papa hopes we'll be able to get to the main land, only 12 miles off. Rumour says the Secessionists are working hard to make New Orleans impregnable, but also that our great success at Fort Donaldson has greatly dispirited them. Papa brought with him from Ft. Monroe a regiment from Michigan, one from Wisconsin and one from Indiana. They are large, strong, active men and look brave.

March 14, 1862. Steam Transport *Constitution*.

The work of disembarking is nearly completed, and I expect to be ashore this evening and in a tent. Gen. Butler, hourly expected, is not yet arrived. Till his arrival ther'll be no movement of the land forces, though I believe it is or was contemplated to-day to try our mortar vessels at Forts Pike and Jackson—the former near the passage into Lake Ponchartrain, and the latter just up the Mississippi. Without more knowledge on the subject than my neighbors, I only conjecture that the Expedition is designed for New Orleans. That we shall meet with determined resistance is probable, I think also that our success is probable. The troops here are in good spirits and anxious to go for-

ward, and I think that both navy and army are impressed with the importance to the cause of a decided success, in an enterprise which once baffled the best British troops—badly commanded. My former subaltern, Capt Kensell, is Gen. Butler's chief of Artillery and is now with Gen. Butler on his way here. Kensell is very partial to his former Captain and, I understand, seconded as much as in his power Gen. Butler's determination to get me.

While on that Hatteras sandbank I cogitated a good deal over a tactical formation for troops which would enable them to act most effectively and with the utmost rapidity in battle, and having succeeded, as I think, I sent before I left Hatteras, a copy to the Sec'y of War, asking for it a week's trial by some of Gen. McClellan batallions. It gave great satisfaction to my colonels at Hatteras, and takes well with the military here. I have great hopes from it, *great* hopes that it will bring success to our arms. So, if not directly, I hope to do something indirectly for victory. Whitney, I believe never cleaned cotton himself, but he invented the gin. So if I do not win victories, I may enable others to do so.

March 24, 1862.

A note from Gen. Butler's Adj. Gen'l has just informed me that a mail goes north from this at two o'clock this afternoon.

Gen. Butler, detained by an accident to his vessel, arrived here from Port Royal only three days ago. By this time we are possessed of some positive idea concerning the destination and objects of the Expedition. All the troops expected are not yet here. We have now about 13,000 and there are some 4000 to come. The force here has been divided into 3 brigades, mine, the 2d brigade, consists of the 4th Wisconsin, 6th Michigan, 21st Indiana, 26th and 30th Massachusetts, a Wisconsin battery, a Massachusetts battery and a company of cavalry, and is considered the best brigade of the three, and being so, will probably be the first to start for the main land. My brigade is chiefly considered the best, because it contains the only Western Regiments in the Expedition, and the Western men, as yet, have been the only troops on our side who have showed prowess and spirit.

I am of course greatly interested and my time much occupied with the work of preparation. Men have not only to be drilled, but equipments looked to, and their daily and prospective wants anticipated. Having done all I can for success, I shall invoke and do daily ask for the blessing of Providence, for the cause of my country.

This is indeed an isolated place, hard to get to and hard to get from. In the matter of mails, and news from the States, one would not be greatly worse off in Kamschatka. My tent is on the north beach of Ship Island, looking out on the Gulf and looking towards you. The weather changeable, ranging from 70 to 50, and Buffalo robes as comfortable and necessary as in Newburgh, in tents without board floors.

The sand about us, inside of my tent and out, is as white, nearly, as this paper, and so fine that the wind blows it everywhere, not respecting eyes, ears, hair, bread, butter, or the pot on the fire. I think sometimes that sand may have its uses in the processes of digestion and in sharpening the teeth. Don't the hens use sand to aid the digestion?

I have been most fortunate in the selection of my staff of seven gentlemen. We have accordingly a most agreeable mess, perfect harmony, good will and good nature. All efficient, too, in their respective

duties. A good staff is not only essential to a commander in the details of business, but can and must greatly assist to establish agreeable relations between himself and his troops. So far, there has not been a word of reproof on my part, or of complaint on theirs. And the regiments, moreover, as I am informed, would have selected me for their commander, if they had had the choice. Now this is a good beginning, is it not?

I may move in 5 days, or not in 10 or 15. But I will always write when opportunity offers all about myself and as much about our doings or intentions as may be proper to commit to a private letter.

March 29, 1862. Saturday, SHIP ISLAND, MISS.

This morning Gen. Butler sent for me to consult about the reg'ts best fitted, by discipline and instruction, to lead our advance toward the Mississippi, and about the necessary outfit in ammunition, clothing and subsistence stores for a movement. The result was that we're to begin to embark six reg'ts and two batteries tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock, and should the weather not be unfavorable, all six will probably be on board their respective transports before night.

I go with Gen'l Butler, the six regiments and two batteries constituting my brigade. The remaining troops on the Island to follow as soon as they can get transportation. We are to co-operate with the navy, who, no doubt, will do their part and more than their part if they can. The land and naval portion of the forces are emulous of each other, and all, I think, look for satisfactory results. In point of numbers, my brigade greatly exceeds our divisions in the old army, and would there be a Major General's command. John and Mott would feel quite martial if they could see papa's brigade on drill or review. They look well and soldierly and move well. I don't believe the other side have any as good. And besides, having our quarrel just, we are thrice armed. Armed also I trust with the Arm that gives all victory and all good.

Daily, in the morning and at night I ask His blessing for the glory and success of my country's efforts to conquer the restoration of the Union, and bring back peace and prosperity. And I pray that the whole country may recognize in such success and acknowledge therein in word and in deed the power and boundless mercy of God. Regarding the subject from a mere political point of view, I do not doubt that the ordeal the country's now passing through will tend to give us the nationality we lack, and restore through the alternations of hope and despondency, success and disaster, the virtue, public and private, and the love of country for which our sires of the first revolution were so distinguished.

The chastisements and chastenings of eternal wisdom and mercy can never fail of their purpose.

I wish I could afford to run a mail steamer to the great city of Gotham. Last dates received at Fort Monroe were to the 5th of March. Nearly a month ago, long enough, too long. So long, it seems almost a year. Meanwhile, how many things are happening at home! What great events too of the highest interest to our country may be transpiring! It cannot all be success, of course. War is never all on one side. It is a game of varying fortune, and apparently necessarily so to the side, even, that finally prevails, in order to beget the stronger interest and persistence.

We have a rumour that the rebel iron clad steamer *Merrimac* made sad work of the frigates *Cumberland* and *Congress* lately in Hampton Roads. The contest was too unequal between impervious iron and destructible wood, and between the locomotive power of steam and sail. But it will work best for us in the end. The North has not yet waked up thoroughly to this war, and it seems that success lulls them into the feeling of security, which their knowledge of superior power is so apt to do. Whips and spurs are a help to us. The rumour also is that we have Manassas, and that there's lately been a great success for our arms in Arkansas. I don't know where the rumours come from, they appear to be in the air: the birds bring them, I suppose. Rumour says, too, that we have No. 10 Island near Columbus, and the last, of this evening, that we have New Orleans. Some truth there must be in all this rumour. The birds, I hope are not against us, though many charming young women with voices like birds are. How do you account for the secession proclivities of the sex? But for the women, many a man would have remained true to the flag he's now in arms against. Is it that statesman and soldiers have not sufficiently acknowledged their power and they're determined to make them?

SHIP ISLAND, In Camp on North Beach. April 11, 1862.

Not embarked yet. Movements are unavoidably uncertain that wait on wind, wave, steam, coal, water, provision and the much careful and laborious preparation of our Navy friends. The time expended has not however been without profit to us or them, and we're certainly nearer our destination than we were.

Such a sand storm as is prevailing—that is, a furious wind storm that drives the sand into everything we eat, drives it, like so much fine snow, tingling in our faces, stopping eyes, ears and nose, making a “feller” sneeze. Don't object to sneezing, for they say it's good luck to sneeze. We sneezed a good deal at Vera Cruz from the same cause. Having come bravely out of that—indeed all the better for it—we trust to come bravely out of this, perhaps like that at Vera Cruz, from the preliminary ordeal to great and complete success.

My poor country! Methinks, I read in the 80th Psalm matter strangely applicable to our national beginnings, to our growth, prosperity and our present divided state and the attitude of France and England toward us. Is not the parallel striking? So much so do I think it, that it is often my morning and evening prayer.

Not a letter has come to me from you since leaving Fort Monroe, March 6. Our newspapers are far behind the times. A chance ship comes in occasionally with news we heard at Old Point before leaving. Not quite so bad as this. We have heard of McClellan's advance, the rebel abandonment of Manassas, etc., but that is the sum of our news to this date. Rumours of the capture of I'd No. 10. No doubt we shall take it. I mean our forces under Gen. Halleck. Probably taken by this time and possibly Richmond Va. by McClellan. Oh, how I hope and pray we shall strike some blow in the work of conquering peace and union, we of the Expedition of the Mississippi.

April 12, 11 A. M. The wind and sand storm of yesterday became last night a furious rain and thunder and lightning storm, upsetting and deluging tents and, worse than all, killing three men near me in one of the reg'ts of my brigade (31st Massachusetts), by lightning

stroke, wounding more or less some 11 others in the same guard tent. At this writing the sky is bright, the sea calm, and all the elements in repose, and but for the sound of musketry and bugle and drum, one might imagine himself alone in the world:—out of the world on a fishing excursion by himself on this sand bank. There's pretty good fishing here, fishing by net and line.

April 15th. At last embarked. Here I am on board of the *Great Republic*, with three regiments of my brigade, our destination the Southwest pass of the Mississippi. The remaining reg'ts of my brigade are on board the *Mississippi* with Gen. Butler and staff. The whole force embarked will be 8 regiments and some three batteries of artillery, a company of sappers and miners, and a company of dismounted cavalry, in all, say, rather less than 7000 men. One of these days, at a fitting time, 7000 or 8000 more will probably follow. Five of the 8 regts, 2 batteries and the company of cavalry belong to my brigade. Gen. Phelps commands the remaining three regt's. My brigade is the 2d, his is the first. But my brigade leads, in consequence, I think, of the good account our western troops elsewhere have given of themselves.

April 16. Still off Ship Island waiting the final orders to sail, expected to be given this afternoon. My ship, the *Great Republic* (good and great name, isn't it, to be entrusted to one's keeping), is to be towed by the U. S. armed steamer *Jackson*. *Jackson* and the *Great Republic*! Is not this all a good omen? If *Jackson* won at New Orleans for the *Great Republic*, ought not the two combined also to win at New Orleans? The navy are in great force and expect to be able to reduce Forts Jackson and St. Philip, chiefly by the use of mortar fire, for which they are abundantly provided. If one shell in 10 falls within the limits for which they are intended, it appears to me that those forts must fall. What the land force will be able to do in reducing the forts can not now be foreseen.

The rebels have stretched a formidable system of chains across the river above Forts Jackson and St. Philip, buoyed up on five vessels securely anchored. The navy propose to cut this chain, and are, they say, furnished with the experts and machinery that can do it. The forts taken or passed, and New Orleans is ours.

My ship the *Great Republic* is famous for the part she played in the Crimean War as a transport of French troops. Conspicuous I say, because of her great proportions and her name, which, alas for the change which has since taken place, was then in such striking harmony with her great proportions. The *Great Republic* carried 3000 French troops at one time from Marseilles to the harbor of Kamiesh in the Crimea. They were on the passage 24 days. We expect to be on our passage hardly more than twice as many hours; may be more, may be less.

Rumours give us Norfolk and lose us Corinth and Island No. 10. But rumours are so plenty and so contradictory that we attach little importance to them. There is a rumour, which if it should ever prevail, I'd like greatly to come true, and that is that we have New Orleans. New Orleans *must* belong to the Union. The capture of New Orleans would tend as much, and perhaps more than any other success, to the restoration of union and peace. This is a commercial and political necessity to the Union States on the banks of the Mississippi, and a political necessity to the whole country. Should we

succeed, my loss in not taking part in the capture of Newberne need not trouble me. In truth, without New Orleans it will not trouble me. Newberne is very well as far as it goes. But it is but the first step towards the results contemplated in organizing the Burnside Expedition. Let us take New Orleans and you'll see.

The orders are that we sail at 3 P. M. today. It's now 15 min. to 1.

Transport Ship *Great Republic*, OFF SOUTHWEST PASS OF MISS.

April 25, 1862.

Arriving here on the 19th we are still here, but leave probably tomorrow at day light for some point near the Quarantine Ground, some 10 miles above Forts Jackson and St. Philip. These forts, having been passed by the fleet, are not only cut off and rendered valueless as a protection to New Orleans, but are also cut off from supplies, rendering their surrender without further attack a simple question of time. We learn this evening that they offered to surrender *conditionally* to the fleet, but were told the surrender must be unconditional. Thus far the navy have had the good fortune to do all that has been done, and the report is they're now on their way to New Orleans, whether to be stopped or not by intervening obstacles in the matter of gunboats, rams, fire rafts and batteries, it's impossible to say. But that the land forces will before long find land enough to co-operate, I have no doubt. Such is the purpose of our contemplated movement tomorrow on the seaside of Fort St. Philip and the Quarantine ground. I have with me three reg'ts on board this ship, and another reg't on board the Steam Transport *Matanzas*, which is to assist our sails with her steam towing powers. Two other reg'ts belonging to my brigade are in advance with Gen. Butler, having left at daylight this morning.

Our ship, the *Great Republic*, the largest sailing ship in the world, is admirable as a transport, with the single exception that her great size and great draft of water make her difficult to handle on a coast, so studded with bars and shoals as this is. Three vessels capable each of carrying a single reg't would have been better for *despatch*—that all important element of success in military operations. Sails, moreover, are too slow and uncertain for these days whether the vessel be large or small. The introduction of steam has affected as much for locomotion by sea, as ironclad sides have for purposes of offence and defence in war by sea. The scales of success will be most apt to incline to the side which has the steam or iron sides. I allude to combined land and water expeditions. That side will be the side which has most money. Money is called the sinews of war—and I suppose the enterprise and skill and daring which put the sinews in motion may be called Mars' nervous system.

This afternoon at 3, I had an agreeable call from Capt. Peardy of a British Steam frigate lying near us. A travelled, liberal minded gentleman, and I doubt not a good sailor. He passed an hour with us over a glass of sherry and ginger nuts. As he came over the side of the ship, he was received by Capt. Hoffman, the guard saluted, and the band played "God save the Queen." I rec'd him near the stern of the ship, and after a few moments chat conducted him to the cabin. The conversation was of course largely taken up with war topics; soldiers, sailors, ships, forts, cannon, etc. He told us he brought out in his ship to Canada two battalions of Guards; that there was plenty of room for

them, for the Guard being picked troops are seldom crowded as troops generally are that are transported by sea. Speaking of the Guards, I told him this anecdote: of a Colo. Somebody from New York who went to Montreal with letters to Sir James McDonald, and was invited to be present at a review of several battalions of the Guards. As they were passing in review, Sir James said "Fine looking troops, Colonel". The Colonel assented. Sir James continued, "They should be fine looking, for they're picked out of the whole British army". "How do ye think they'd look in the States, Colonel?" "Not so well as they do here, Sir James." "How so?" said Sir James. "Why", said the Colonel, "they'd be without *arms*". "Ah", said Sir James, "that's well said, I like that." The colonel's ready wit won the heart of the Waterloo veteran. A gold snuff box presented to the Duke of Wellington, to be by him presented to the bravest man in the British army, was given by the great Duke to Lt. Gen. Sir James McDonald, who was at the Battle of Waterloo a Captain in the Guards, and who, with the assistance of a sergeant, closed the gate of the Chateau of Huegemont at the moment when the French assaulting column was about to enter. This timely and gallant act saved the position to the British, and ultimately won the battle of Waterloo. I recollect to have met Sir James McDonald at West Point, in the summer of 43 or 44.

Transport ship *Great Republic*, OFF PASS A LOUTRE.
April 26, 1862.

We got fairly under weigh at a quarter to ten this morning in tow of Steamer *Matanzas*, in order to overtake Gen. Butler who had preceded me with two regts of my brigade, to the quarantine ground below New Orleans. We had hardly been under weigh 20 minutes, when there was a cry of "man overboard" and a rush to the side of the ship. It proved to be one of the crew, who fell from the vessel while engaged about the anchor. The poor fellow never rose above the surface, and was seen for a moment only under the surface, as if in the act of swimming. Ropes and life preservers were thrown him in vain. I was told on enquiry that he could not swim. Swimming indeed might not have saved him, for at the rate the ship was going, he must have been left far behind before a boat could have gone to his assistance. It's a startling cry, that of "man overboard!!" Poor fellow!

April 27. A quarter after 8 A. M. arrived off the north point of Sable Island, was signalled from the steamer *Mississippi*, Gen. Butler's ship, to come to anchor. Found upon our arrival, that part of the 26th Massachusetts regt had been landed at the Quarantine Ground some 7 miles above Ft. St. Philip. Tomorrow the disembarkation of the other regiments will follow, should the rebels fail to surrender the forts.

I read today a letter, dated April 24, from Commodore Farragut to Gen. Butler, saying that the fleet had sunk the ram *Manassas* and destroyed 11 rebel gunboats, and that he was about to continue up the river to N. Orleans. We learn this morning that the Commodore is before N. Orleans, and that the Mayor of N. Orleans, a Union man, was on board the flagship, making terms for the surrender of the city. The rebel forces in Fts. Jackson and St. Philip can hardly escape capture. They may put it off, but with what benefit to themselves, I cannot see.

Gen. Lovell, late Lieut 4th Art'y, and Gen. Duncan, late Lieut 3d

art'y, are both said to be in Fort Jackson. I'd rather all the others should escape than lose the two generals. Lovell, especially, who, at the time he went South was in office in New York as an asst Street Commissioner. If my recollection serves me, he plotted treason and held on to office until after the disaster of Bull Run. Lovell is the son of Dr. Lovell, Dr. Lawson's predecessor in the office of Surgeon Gen'l of the army, was born in Washington, but both father and mother, I believe, were from Massachusetts. Both have been dead several years. He was associated with the filibustering schemes of Gen. Quitman and other leading southern men towards Cuba and Central America, and in the latter is understood to have sold his services for \$10,000. He embarked in this rebellion as a speculation, no doubt, which is likely, happily for the right, to be as barren of gain to himself and coadjutors as the filibustering projects. So perish the wrong and the wrongdoer forever. And so will he fail and perish forever, if we as a people repent and pray. Calamity will bless us more than the prosperity has cursed us, if it restore the nation's integrity to the standard of the days of Washington. If Calamity will do this let us all pray for that measure of it. Let us pray to be corrected, but not in anger, lest we be consumed.

April 28. At Quarantine Ground, 65 miles below New Orleans—arrived at 10½ P. M. in row boats accompanied by 2 companies of 4th Wisconsin regt and 1 company of Indianians. Found Gen. Butler had gone to New Orleans and found Colo. Jones with 26th Mass. reg't in charge of the Quarantine premises. I came here by order of Gen. Butler to assume command so as to regulate, or rather prevent the Colo. and a Lt. of Engineers from falling out. The remainder of the troops, including the remaining regts of my brigade, I directed to come to New Orleans by way of the Passes.

April 29. Gen. Butler arrived from New Orleans announcing the surrender of the city and all the Forts, and that the rebel troops under Gen. Lovell had all left post haste for Corinth. We occupy New Orleans as soon as our steamers can take us there. Some have already started. The 26th Mass. regt occupy this point (Quarantine Ground), a post across the river, and Forts St. Philip and Jackson. Gen. Butler brings word that the rebels say they're going to try another battle near Corinth, in which, if failing, they intend to give up rebelling. So mote it be, that they be again disastrously beaten, and at last into submission to good government, into law, loyalty and order.

April 30, 1862. QUARANTINE GROUND, 6.10 A. M.

I'm just informed that a mail goes from this direct to New York. We are still at Quarantine, but our position is a locomotive one. Not many hours more, and it is hoped we shall occupy N. Orleans. Some vessels of the Navy are now holding it in subjection with their guns. The population, they tell us, is violently secession, and, what is worse, are under the rule of a mob. Rigid military rule is what the city wants to restore order, protection and prosperity. This will be done, and acts of mob violence will be repressed by military force. Gen. Butler is sitting at the same table with me writing his dispatches to the War Dep't. They are to go by this mail.

The success of the Navy is something new in the annals of war. But the public will probably confound the ability of steam vessels of

war to pass forts, thus avoiding the fire of their guns, and the ability to contend with them. The forts on the Mississippi defended the approach to New Orleans and when passed, New Orleans was, of course, obliged to fall. Had the rebels been able to block up the passage by rafts or otherwise, so as to keep the war vessels under the fire of the forts' guns, the vessels must have been destroyed. Luckily for us, the great depth and great current and width of the Mississippi rendered the stoppage of the river by rafts or otherwise impossible to the rebels and perhaps impossible in fact.

At any rate the success of the navy is great, providential, for there is only about 100 killed and wounded. I believe the last battle at Corinth, a land battle, cost us some thousands.

But there is this significant fact in regard to the rebel defence of Forts Jackson and St. Philip, that their troops positively mutinied and refused to continue at the guns, then left the forts in a body, leaving their officers behind, and spiking the guns that bore on their retreat. However, the forts are still, notwithstanding the fire of the vessels, in good defensible condition, and their surrender was no doubt hastened by many days, by a movement of the land troops in row boats, on their rear, cutting them off from all supplies. After reaching New Orleans we shall probably endeavor to get up beyond Baton Rouge, or as far as the point of the Red River's entrance into the Mississippi. The purpose of this is to cut off supplies and make a demonstration in favor of Gen. Buell.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., May 1, 1862.

Leaving Quarantine Ground, 65 to 70 miles below this, 2 o'clock this morning, we arrived off the city at 12 M. and came to anchor at 12.30, thus having made the passage of 70 miles against a 5 mile current in about 10 hours. Myself and staff were on board the steam transport *Mississippi*, with Gen. Butler.

By 6 o'clock this evening, two reg'ts of my brigade, the 4th Wisconsin and 31st Massachusetts, and 4 pieces of artillery were landed, and amidst a dense crowd of disaffected, marched and took quarters at the Custom House. Muskets and art'y loaded and ready to meet force with force. The city has a look of utter desertion, by everybody but the rabble, not a window, door or shop open of any sort; not a vessel along the whole levee. Having broken open one of the doors of the Custom House, the reg'ts entered and were quartered, and myself and staff also took lodgings here.

I occupy the private office of the late U. S. Collector, for office and lodgings. Sofa, chairs, desks, tables—handsome French furniture, a handsome carpet, curtains, maps, clock, etc., complete the furniture of this airy handsome room. We take our meals at a French restaurant, very expensive, \$3 to \$5 a day.

May 2. I enclose with this Gen. Butler's Proclamation to the inhabitants of New Orleans, and people of Louisiana. Before its publication, the Gen'l invited the Mayor and Common Council of the City, and Mr. Pierre Soule, late Senator of the United States, to meet him at the Gen'l's lodgings at the St. Charles Hotel. The Proclamation was read to them. At first Mr. Soule and the Common Council objected to it *in toto*. Mr. Soule made an eloquent epeech, acknowledging themselves conquered and appealing to the generosity of the victors. Gen. Butler answered the speech, and step by step forced Mr. Soule to

abandon his objections, and so the Common Council. The Conference began at 8 in the evening and continued through about 2 hours and a half. It broke up pretty amicably. While [this was] going on, the 4th Wisconsin and 2 pieces of artillery keep the street clear and quiet near the hotel and the band discoursed our national airs and others. Some preliminaries not agreed upon when the Conference ended are to be settled at 11 tomorrow morning.

May 3. City perfectly orderly and quiet last night, a good many shops open this morning; the crowd in the streets greatly diminished in numbers and not so sullen; insulting and jeering remarks at Yankees and Bull Run almost entirely abandoned. Sentinels are ordered to enter the crowd and seize and turn over to the Guard all such persons to be put at hard labor at Fort Jackson. From the beginning I have felt perfectly easy about the mob, and thus far have gone about the city as my business required without further precaution than to have one or two of my staff with me. The densest crowd has invariably opened for me to pass. "Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just." Thus do I feel, and I believe thus do we all feel. The rebel forces under General Lovell, six or seven thousand, who abandoned the city on our entering it, are encamped 70 miles from New Orleans north, on the New Orleans and Great Northern R. Road, passing through Jackson, Memphis, etc. We ought to have here 50,000 men to act from here in conjunction with Gen'ls Halleck and Buell. I hope the Gov't will recognize the importance of our position, and make the best of it. An officer is going from this to Washington to urge this.

I understand some of the principal rebels say that they mean to try another great battle in the valley of the Mississippi, and if they fail, give up and abandon the war. So mote it be. I pray daily for the success of our country's arms and councils.

May 5. I expected to have made a movement with my brigade ere this, but our limited transportation prevents. The truth is, I do not think it prudent to make detachments from our limited force. The city, indeed, is apparently in subjection, but a force of 6500 men is not in excess, for the object of keeping so large a disaffected population as this in order. Disaffected, I say. Disaffection against the Gov't of the United States is almost universal. One has to see to believe. Secession stares us in the face from every face—from infancy to old age. The girls and women even (the angels) look secession. A shop door here and there only open, and sometimes we have even to take by force and then to pay. Such is the reluctance of people who live by selling to sell to us. The other day all the printing offices refused to print Gen. Butler's proclamation. I called for printers from the reg'ts, sent a guard with them to the office of the *True Delta* and had the Proclamation printed. Gradually, however, they must relax. Their interest and their comfort will constrain them. But there will never be any love for the Union—not in our generation.

May 5. Later in the day.

Shops are beginning to open: well dressed people are beginning to show themselves in the streets: crowds of the vulgar are less numerous and less frequent. To outsiders and insiders, in respectful and apparently contented silence, the band of the 4th Wisconsin this evening discoursed waltzes and marches and songs, on the portico of the St. Charles Hotel.

News of an important character is daily looked for from the army before Richmond. We have rumours of every sort from several directions. But I know that rumours, even here, in the hot bed of secession, recounting rebel success, are regard[ed] with great distrust by rebels themselves. They are despondent, say they're beaten but not subdued. I cannot account for the signal and wonderful passing of the Forts on the Mississippi by the Fleet with the utterly inconsiderable loss of life, but by regarding it as the work of Providence. No other view will account for the success. I look confidently to His aid in the future, and believe He has made our cause His cause.

May 6. You can hardly guess how expensive the most ordinary board is now here. Provisions are enormously high. Mutton 65 cents a pound, flour at \$50 a barrel—not to be had indeed. The poor, as you may imagine, greatly distressed. Yesterday my dinner and a cup of coffee at night cost \$6.00. But, happily, prices must soon come down, permission having been given by Gen. Butler to bring flour from Mobile and cattle from the Red River. Coffee without milk 25 cents a cup. I'm ashamed of being compelled to squander my money for the mere privilege of *eating*. I think this is cheating you and our babies. Well it cannot and must not continue many days, for as a last resort, I can and will take to the soldier's ration.

May 7, 12 M. A mail leaves probably in a few hours direct for N. York, and in the midst of preparation for an expected move with two reg'ts of my brigade up the river, I write to close this letter giving one day's later tidings. More shops open today than yesterday, more of an air of business in the hitherto deserted streets. Yet we do not deceive ourselves by thinking that this place can be held for the Union except by military force. There is no Union feeling in all New Orleans.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER 3 miles below Vicksburg,
Steam Transport *Laurel Hill*. May 22, 1862.

Here we are:—some $\frac{1}{2}$ doz gunboats and flag officer Farragut; and two of my reg'ts and a battery of artillery contemplating this focus of Secession, Vicksburg, with its high bluffs crowned with batteries and its show of rebel troops.

My force is an independent though co-operating force. But our combined force, though equal to a profitable diversion in behalf of our army at Corinth is unequal to the capture and holding of Vicksburg. Instead of 2000 men, I ought to have at least 10,000. But I have all Gen. Butler could afford to spare from the holding of New Orleans with its numerous and hostile population. There's been a little firing of cannon and a little skirmishing with infantry, but nothing of importance.

The Flag-officer may damage the rebel batteries and demolish the town with his big guns, but our forces combined can neither capture nor hold it if captured. For with their 8 or 10 thousand and Jackson an hour by rail away with forces in reserve, our 2000 have to consider discretion the better part of valor. It's provoking, isn't it?

So I think, operations here, until a competent land force can be brought forward, and until the river between this and Memphis is cleared out by Foote's gunboats and Halleck's and Buell's forces, must be limited to a diversion and blockade. A diversion, by compelling Beauregard to keep a large force here, and thus relieve our army near

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—21.

Corinth of so much rebel force, and a blockade of the river from Vicksburg down to New Orleans, cutting off supplies of food, as flour, corn, beef cattle, etc., drawn by the rebel army from the corresponding country on the west of the Miss. You cannot conceive the flooded condition of the country on both banks of the Mississippi. Water 5 and more feet over the levees. Utter destruction to cotton and other crops. Destruction to cattle and property. Houses almost submerged, abandoned by their inhabitants. One wide desolation, with here and there a spot only above water from here to New Orleans. So I'm told it is above Vicksburg, and yet the June rise of water is to come. War, with all its losses can hardly be worse for starvation and misery. Poor Arkansas is largely flooded of course, your rebel State. What a state for a loyal woman to have been nurtured in. And the blackies, they swarm wherever there's a dry spot to stand on, and wave us a welcome with their hats, and grin their delight at the hope we've come to free them. Skiffs bearing them away from their masters are constantly met with floating down the river. Where they can go and how they can subsist is hard to say. But many must eventually escape and be otherwise lost by starvation to their masters.

These fanatic slaveholders, the counterparts of our abolition fanatics, have thrown overboard, in throwing off their allegiance to the Gov't of the United States, the only protection to their slave property. A party of these slaveholding gentlemen called on me the other day to ask if we would not assist them to recover their slaves. I answered it was a singular request to ask assistance from an authority they had repudiated; going on to say, that I did not doubt, that if they could convince Gen. Butler of their loyalty to the Union, he might help them, not by the employment of force, but by the moral weight of his declaration, that the slave property of loyal inhabitants was entitled to all the protection and guarantees promised in the Constitution of the United States. These secession people must see that their principles lead to nothing but loss and ruin, and yet they appear to be as enamoured of Secession, as if she promised them every good. Strange madness! Calamity, I fear, is the only thing that can restore them to their senses. We have no news here from Corinth. Vague rumours and occasional unreliable secession newspaper statements only. We're as much out of the world here with the river closed above us, and infrequent communication with New Orleans, itself so far from all that interest home, as we would be at the north pole. God grant that the scourge of war which desolates the land may soon end, chastising us as a nation, into the virtue and the religion we have so widely departed from. We must be chastised into reverence for law and order, reverence for right and the fear of God.

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 2, 1862.

I write with constant interruptions, applications of all kinds. It's a court martial, rations, guards, pickets, distressed inhabitants wanting passes, others asking for redress of grievances; reports of the advance of the enemy's forces. And so it goes, affording little time for the most necessary and most ordinary processes of eating and sleeping.

We are here in the capital of the State of Louisiana. It's a pretty town, and an old town, prettily situated. I have quartered one reg't in the State House, a beautiful building with terraced grounds bordered with trees and flowers. In the rotunda of the State House stands a

life size statue of Washington, by the sculptor Powers. And a sentinel has, by my orders, been placed over it to stand watch and ward night and day.

Within this building are the houses of the legislature, Senate and Representatives; the libraries and archives of the State. In the Senate Chamber, to the right and left of the Speaker's chair hang two fine portraits, one of Washington as President, and one of Gen. Taylor as President. All these things will be guarded by our troops with scrupulous care.

I must tell you what the papers may give you a wrong version of, or in some way excite your apprehensions for my personal safety. My aid de camp Lt. DeKay was severely and it is feared fatally wounded in a skirmish on the evening of the 26th of May, at a place called Grand Gulf, on the east bank of the Mississippi, some 50 miles below Vicksburg. As we passed down the river, a rebel battery of four field pieces concealed by the trees opened upon our transport striking the boat repeatedly, and sending the shot through our crowds of men. Most providentially one man only was killed and an officer wounded. Such an escape as it was, was indeed marvellous. Well, we put our boats about and returned to chastise the vagrants. Our escort, two gunboats and a sloop of war, proceeded to the point whence the fire came, opening some of their guns on the place of the battery, and afterwards on the town near by, supposed to be in league with the attacking party. Soon white flags went up in all directions, and I sent a detachment of four companies to capture the battery and their camp. Mr. DeKay applied to accompany the detachment. Arriving on the ground, the enemy was found to have decamped with their guns and tents, the last just leaving. Our people pursued them, skirmishing as they went. Lieut. DeKay very incautiously, but very gallantly, had gotten in advance of the advance guard, and, without his suspicion or knowledge, had gotten within 15 paces of a rebel, whom in the twilight he took to be one of our own people. The rebel turned upon him, levelled his piece and shot him. Seven buck shot struck his left arm at or near the elbow, and five entered his left side and back. Poor fellow, he lies bleeding profusely, and his lower limbs entirely paralyzed. Fatally, I'm afraid, he is wounded. I have just sent him north, that is, I have sent him to New Orleans to go north at the first opportunity, which will probably be in a day or two. I have written to his mother at Newport, Rhode Island, and to his uncle, Charles Augustus Davis in New York.

Mr. DeKay will steam direct to New York; look out for his arrival. Poor fellow, I'm afraid he'll not survive to reach his destination. Poor fellow, he was gallant enough and his generous qualities had endeared him to us all. I shall miss him greatly, socially and officially. I pray for his restoration to health, and shall keep his place open for him.

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 11, 1862.

I was at dinner when Capt. Hoffman came in with the mail. You mention Banks' falling back, but not the rumored disaster to Gen. McClellan's army. The latter came to us here through rebel sources, I don't believe [it]. There may have been a repulse. Repulses are not uncommon in great siege operations. There were many in the War of the Crimea before Sevastopol, but the end at last came. So—let us hope we shall have a victorious ending. Let us ask God to help us, and then we shall prevail.

June 13. Rumours of disaster come to us from Richmond. I don't believe them. The people here with all their sympathies in favor of rebellion do believe, and I suppose, in secret rejoice.

From above we have rumours of the abandonment of Fort Pillow and the falling back of Beauregard from Corinth to Colona in Alabama some 30 miles, with the loss of a million's worth of provisions. Rumours also say that in a great gunboat engagement Foote has again signally prevailed. Vicksburg is being fortified and strongly armed, and several points, bluffs, between this and Vicksburg are or are to be fortified, so that going from this to Vicksburg will involve partial engagements from point to point between our gunboats, and troops perhaps, and the rebel defences. Flag-officer Farragut is now lying off this place with several vessels of the fleet, and awaiting Butler's mortar vessels before ascending the river to attempt the reduction of Vicksburg, and thence go on to join or meet Commodore Foote.

A land force is designed to cooperate with flag-officer Farragut from Gen. Butler's division, and it is probable I shall have command of that force. What it may be enabled to do cannot be foreseen for owing to the flooded condition of the country, some 30 miles below Vicksburg, there are few places where troops can be landed, or where they can be used.

Should, however, the rumoured great disaster to McClellan's army prove true, it's likely that Gen'l Butler will not deem it prudent to spare any troops (from his really small force for the task of keeping in subjection so large and disaffected a city as New Orleans) to cooperate with Flag-officer Farragut in the reduction of Vicksburg. Then the Flag-officer will probably simply run by Vicksburg and meet Commodore Foote and come down with him, and then try their hand at Vicksburg with any land force it may be practicable to detach from Gen. Halleck or Gen. Butler.

One can hardly imagine that these people of Louisiana ever had any attachment for the Union. Here and there a man who acknowledges Union sentiments with his face averted, and in a whisper, for less often do we find a woman: on the contrary, for the most part almost violent, threatening to spit in the faces of union officers. Such venom one must see to believe. Such unsexing was hardly ever before in any cause or country so marked and so universal. I look at them and think of fallen angels.

By the way, a rumour we cannot trace says we have Richmond. I should incline to believe this with all my confidence in McClellan's skill and the excellence imputed to his army. But there are some bright spots even with war all around us with its ever changing phases of success and disaster. There is a bright spot to me on the banks of the Hudson. Wife and children, and a home consecrated to the amenities and charities of Christian life. Loving hearts that shelter and watch over wife and little ones.

June 14. Mr. Whitney, a former Massachusetts man, but long resident in this country, reports at HdQrs this morning the surrender of Memphis to Capt. Davis, and the destruction by Davis of the rebel fleet of gun boats in sight of the population of Memphis. So now Davis and his fleet may get to Vicksburg before Flag Officer Farragut and myself. There are now no obstacles between Memphis and Vicksburg to keep back Davis except 400 miles of steaming, with the current

to assist the steam. The flag officer and myself are impatient to get off and have a hand in opening the navigation of the Father of Waters.

What an extraordinary somersault the *London Times* has lately executed on the subject of the military power of the United States! The last *Times* speaks of Mr. Lincoln as wielding more power than the first Napoleon did, and that if the whole British army were sent to New York, it would be lost in the great armies of the Union, and that all the British fleet could not add to the sufficiency for all purposes of war, of our own. What a somersault! The end must be at hand when John Bull's representative newspaper talks in this way.

June 15. Went to Church with Capt. Hoffman (Dr. Gurlo's Church, Episcopal), and took the Sacrament, asking the Blessing of God on my efforts to save my country.

BATON ROUGE, June 16, 1862.

In a separate command and in a factious city, I'm not only a military commander, but necessarily an administrator of civil affairs, judge, court and jury in more cases than I would wish to be, if I could choose. My time is more cut up even than yours with our daughter on your knee. Such a whirl of solicitation, remonstrance and enquiry I never expected to be a martyr to. I've hardly a moment to myself, really the servant of the public. Here's a guerrilla case of joint stock property with an innocent, inoffensive man. The guerilla's property is confiscated and destroyed, how are we to shield the inoffensive partner? It Can't be done. These claims must be deferred, until peace comes, for the action of Congress. All sorts of complications: a rebel rents land of a widow, owes her for rent. His property was confiscated and the widow exhibits the articles of agreement, and shows the indebtedness by regular account. She asks for a cow in part payment. And I order the officer in charge of the property to give her a cow. The cow was among the oxen, and mules and cows of which the guerilla rebel was dispossessed, etc., etc.

A financial case comes up. Certain parties representing the city corporation had issued small bills redeemable in confederate notes. Confederate notes are proscribed, and the Mayor and council call to ask what they shall do. Small bills are required for circulation:—there's no other way. Without these bills of the corporation no one can buy his marketing. I say, "Call a meeting of the council and call in all small notes they have issued redeemable in Confederate paper, and issue a corresponding sum pledging the property and faith of the city for their redemption", and so forth.

June 17. Flag officer Farragut and Capt. Bell, his fleet Captain, dined with us today. Capt. Bell tells me that his wife and family reside in Newburgh, and that he's going to write his wife that you live in the same town. He's a North Carolinian, and highly loyal. Hardly through my tea, when a case was presented by a man (clergyman), whose horses and mules had been seized by one of my officers on the ground of connection with the guerillas. He came this afternoon and complained, averring that he had nothing to do with the rebellion in any way, and had from the beginning preached against it from his pulpit. I told him to call this evening and meet the officer in my presence, that I might do him justice after a full hearing of both sides. The officer came and told a pretty hard and connected story in direct contradiction to the preacher's assertions, *viz.*: that he had counselled his flock to rise

against the invaders, and if with no other arms, like Samson to slay with the jawbone of an ass. The preacher did not meet with us according to appointment, and so his horses and mules are still retained. These people are strangely bitter, and many forbearing men on our side, Northern and Southern loyalists, think leniency is all a mistake, but that the rebellionists must be chastized into loyalty.

June 18. A visit just now from a lady and her husband about a valuable mulatto run away from them. I told the lady to stop the war and all such troubles would cease, that Southern women had done so much to bring about this war, and they must now do as much to end it. The lady smiled and went on her way—pondering seriously.

June 19, 6 P. M. William is packing bedding, mess effects, etc., etc., for a start. I shall embark about 7, bound for Memphis perhaps, or to meet Capt. Davis and gunboats perhaps no higher up than Vicksburg. Flag-officer Farragut and myself are to co-operate.

My Flagship is the *Louisiana Belle*, a small steamer on which I embark with my staff only. I have some 8 river steamers besides for four regiments and nearly two whole batteries of field artillery. The strength of the four regts and the art'y will be about 3200 men. People, who pretend to be knowing and wise, say we'll meet with no opposition at Vicksburg. I leave about 1200 men, and 5 guns, here for the protection of the place, Gov't stores and buildings. Rumors that the place is to be attacked when I leave are not credited by me.

Flag Ship *Hartford*, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, just above Vicksburg,

June 28, [18]62.

I arrived just below Vicksburg from Baton Rouge, June 25 and commenced on the 27th to cut off by a canal the bend opposite Vicksburg. It's a great work and not of certain execution, for the river is falling rapidly. If the canal succeeds, Vicksburg is cut off and the Mississippi river turned, and Vicksburg and its defences and batteries are conquered by the shovel.

This morning at 4 o'clock, the fleet under Flag officer Farragut attacked the batteries at Vicksburg, and after many hours firing passed the batteries without reducing them. Seven vessels passed the batteries, and all the mortar vessels, and some 5 gunboats remained behind. I had a battery of 8 guns established to assist the (Navy), who did admirably. My force of 3300 was inadequate to storming the batteries, and we are awaiting reinforcements from Gen. Halleck, who is reported to be at Memphis with 80,000 men. The Vicksburgers are well fortified and have from 15 to 20 thousand men. How did I get here? I crossed over on horseback from my camp, made signal for a boat which came, and I've just dined with Flag officer.

The proposed cut off is 4 miles from Vicksburg. If the cut succeeds, the Mississippi will take the course of the cut off and Vicksburg becomes an inland town with a mere creek in front of it. So the batteries will be made useless, and Vicksburg will fall with the spade.

Flagship *Hartford*, JUST ABOVE VICKSBURG, July 2, 1862.

Here I am again having again crossed the bend, on horseback, to confer with Flag-officer Farragut, and this time also with Flag-officer Davis who arrived here from Memphis yesterday. The great part of both fleets is now just above Vicksburg—in a short two miles—and are

yet awaiting events. We hope for the arrival of a considerable force from above, but in the mean time are busy in our own way. The navy mortar vessels firing shells from time to time, and our own field guns held ready for use when the moment arrives for using them to the best advantage. But also the land forces are engaged in a cut off canal, which if successful, will beyond all doubt capture Vicksburg. And we hope largely for success, notwithstanding the rapid falling of the river. I have upwards of 700 contrabands employed on the work, which have been taken by my armed parties from the plantations, 3 to 5 miles around. They work and shout as they work, thinking they're working for their freedom, and if the canal is a success will deserve it and shall have it.

The weather has been oppressively warm, but the last two days have been overcast and comparatively cool. Much advantage this to our fellows who have to delve and dig on the canal. The contrabands, on the contrary, flourish and glisten and shine most when the sun's the hottest. And long may they flourish, if the cut off's a success.

In these days we're looking for the great battle at Richmond, the battle of the war and which is to end the war. Desperate will be the fray: twice desperate to those who have everything to lose by defeat. But success on our side is hardly less necessary, and that soon. For the crowds of the spinning mills at Manchester crying for bread is a strong motive for intervention by Mr. Bull, and the loss of import trade a strong motive for intervention to Louis Nap'l'n. A great battle won by us at Richmond, and there'll not be the shadow of a southern Confederacy left to intervene for. This success is our hope, and no doubt the hope and determination of the army before Richmond. We have a Chicago paper of the 27th of June, nothing conclusive in it, but that the great battle has not yet taken place, but was in expectancy. Capt. Davis tells me he has learned from the newspapers that McClellan had established his first parallel, the rebels not having been able to prevent it. If so, it is the beginning of the chapter which is to record the capture of the rebel capital. For, if they could not prevent the establishing of our first parallel, they will not be able to stop the succeeding works of approach.

July 18, 1862. BELOW VICKSBURG, Louisiana side of river.

We, the navies and myself, that is, the lower Fleet of Flag officer Farragut and the upper Fleet of Commodore Davis, and my 2500 are still here blockading Vicksburg. Up to the 11th inst our prospects were promising that the canal we were cutting would succeed in turning the course of the Mississippi and thus cut off Vicksburg from the Mississippi and make it an inland town, and render useless all its guns and great batteries. But alas, on the 11th, the canal caved in at several points and so delayed the work, that the end of three days found us some feet above the level of the river, and the water falling faster then we could dig. Thus we have encountered at least temporary failure after great labor and some anxiety. If not interrupted by the rebels, nor stopped by orders from HdQrs. it is my purpose to cut a real canal, to the depth of the lowest fall of the river, here say 40 to 45 feet, which work will employ 3000 negroes for 3 months. Something of a task, is it not?

But how shall I describe this habitation of ours? It's now afloat and

now ashore; sometimes by land, sometimes by water. Today on board a transport river steamer, tomorrow on land, which two weeks ago was water. Yes, land, now 16 to 18 feet above the river, was 2 months ago 4 feet under the river. Happily the excavation we have made is a mighty ditch, and the earth thrown up a respectable parapet which can be turned to military purposes if necessary.

To vary the monotony of almost daily canonading between the fleet (and sometimes our field batteries) and the rebels, we had unexpectedly, about 8 in the morning of the 15th, a visit from the ram *Arkansas*, an iron clad rebel. She ran through our fleet, receiving their broadsides, not without perceptible injury, and took refuge under the guns of Vicksburg. She is now lying between Commodore Davis' fleet above and Commodore Farragut's fleet below Vicksburg. She came down from the Yazoo River, which enters the Mississippi some 7 miles above Vicksburg. But I will tell the story as it happened.

At 5 in the morning of July 5th, two of our gun boats of Commodore Davis' fleet, and a ram of Col. Ellett's fleet of army rams, started from the upper side of the bend opposite Vicksburg to go up the Yazoo River to reconnoiter, to find out about this very ram *Arkansas*, ascertained being built there and nearing completion, and learn what land batteries and land forces protected her, with a view to a joint expedition on my part and the fleet. At 6 whom should they meet but the rebel ram coming down the Yazoo? Well, of course they engaged her, and she returned their fire and kept on. One of our gunboats, the *Carondelet*, an iron clad, kept side by side with her, exchanging broadsides, for at least 5 miles, when a break in her steering apparatus enabled the rebel to leave her behind. And so she came on and on and was on the fleets of Commodore Davis and Farragut before they knew or suspected her vicinity. Unluckily for us (to save coal) none of our steam fleet had steam enough to follow the rebel; so after taking their broadsides with the best grace she could, she passed down and ensconced herself under the guns of Vicksburg. In the night of the 15th Flag officer Farragut came down with the greater part of his fleet, engaged the batteries of the town, and tried to find the ram in order to run her down. But as she is very low in the water, and about the color of the river bank, and the night very dark, the rebel monster could not be seen and so escaped destruction. There she lies in sight of us, and deserters say will try to pass down the river to New Orleans and Mobile, which she will not do unless it happens to be pitch dark: for Commodore Farragut is determined to destroy her in some way or other, no matter at what sacrifice. Should she pass him, he with the fleet will follow and overtake her. I wish the ram was a sheep!

July 20. Sunday morning, everybody, blacks and all, resting from the labors of the week. It's now 15 minutes to 9 A. M. and the thermometer at 90 in the shade. Such hot weather as we have here is seldom experienced anywhere, and what is worse, the drying up of the lately overflowed land gives rise to a malarious atmosphere, which is telling alarmingly on the health of the troops. Nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ of my whole force is on the sick list. I have not told you that Mr. DeKay died of his wound June 27th. My remaining A. D. C., Mr. Biddle, left me yesterday to go up the river and home with a fever on him, and my Adj. Gen. Capt. Hoffman is just taken with fever. The navy, too, is suffering dreadfully from disease, and it would not surprise me if the decimation

of troops and sailors by disease did not compel the abandonment of this Expedition until the return of frost and cool weather. A great disappointment this to all concerned. Many of us entertained hopes of accomplishing in the Cutoff something worth suffering for, and as long as that prospect was before us, officers and men kept back disease by the mere force of resolution. But now that the prospect has failed, the disposition is general to give way. In my own case, happily, my health does not give way, but I confess that my hopes to accomplish the object of my part of the Expedition, surrounded as I am by the sick and desponding, sometimes do give way. This morning the commanders of regiments are to meet me at my flagship *Louisiana Belle*, by my own appointment. I shall instruct them to enquire into the causes of disease, and through their surgeons to report upon the means of preventing or at least modifying.

The inhabitants say this season is unusually unhealthy—many sick themselves, and all men women and children look sick—thin, pale spiritless and yellow. A neighboring physician told me this morning that acclimating did not exempt the resident from the ordinary effects of malaria; that the climate appeared to be perfectly impartial between resident and stranger. A delectable habitation indeed. Again, many of our people not on sick report are yet so affected by malaria as to be good for nothing—feeling unequal to any exertion of mind and body. This is the worse phase.

July 21. Still at our usual avocations of entrenching and canalling. The sick report receives its customary addition, and I'm preparing to send all the sick down the river to Baton Rouge, some 1100! But I'm not discouraged. I know these things to be the accustomed accompaniment of war. The troops do not, and therefore despond more or less. But, I feel, that in this crisis of our country's fortunes our country's success or failure, desponding is not the cure—desponding is neither safety nor success.

The Confiscation Act and Emancipation Act of Congress of recent passage must bring the Southerners to their senses, or culminate in their destruction. If the war continues a year longer, I don't see how they're to escape a servile war. The negroes are flying from their masters in all directions, and have become thoroughly impressed with the *idea* of being free. Old, decrepit men and women, even, come into our lines, whose old age and infirmities were probably well provided for. Yet they leave the comforts their age and infirmities require, for freedom, which, may be, has been the dream of all their lives. That idea of being free, how can they ever be dispossessed of it? Never. The doom of slavery is already written, unless the South stop the rebellion. They began the rebellion to establish a great slave empire: they must stop the rebellion to save their country from destruction and servile war, and perhaps themselves from negro domination and a Black Republic. What a terrible punishment!

This is my third letter by the up river route. We cross the bend opposite Vicksburg by land, and thus communicate with the up river fleet, and get mails from Memphis and St. Louis.

It seems to be my good or bad fortune to get into the newspapers and get more abuse than praise. I hope it may be my really good fortune to do something to silence all slander and slanderers. We have corrupt combinations—old party combinations—in our volunteer forces

Bad, unscrupulous men. But they cannot prevail. The truth must beat them thousand to one.

I believe it is the intention of the fleet to attempt the destruction of the ram this afternoon. She must be destroyed, or we cannot maintain our supremacy on the Mississippi. If destroyed, I may go to Baton Rouge, unless the force with me be necessary to holding this point of land opposite Vicksburg I now hold. My only doubt about the propriety of remaining is whether it will be possible to keep troops here during the more sickly months of August and September. Nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of my present force are unfit for duty now.

BELOW VICKSBURG, in sight of the town, the batteries, and the Ram,
July 21, 1862.

*To Mrs. M. A. Bailey.*²

Is every body abused in the newspapers as well as I am? My hope and prayer is to be permitted to achieve something to silence all slander and all slanderers. Our country and ourselves are in other hands, let us hope, than those of party politicians and corrupt men:—corrupt combinations, who seek to effect their own schemes in our volunteer army as they have hitherto in civil life.

It is impossible slander should succeed against truth and virtue. It is impossible the corrupt should prevail over the upright.

I've been here since June 29, trying to cut off Vicksburg by a canal across the bend opposite. On July 11, the bottom of our ditch was $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet below the Mississippi, and we should have opened it for the water, but for a slide or cave in which delayed so in removing it, that when it was done, the river had fallen some three feet below the grade of the canal's bottom, and was falling faster than we could dig with our 1500 contrabands. Well, what am I doing now? Waiting for land forces from above to take Vicksburg with, say 15,000. I have written twice to Gen. Grant. Commodore Farragut has written to Gen. Halleck. From the latter has come an answer he had no troops to spare: from the former I have not heard. Gen. Butler cannot spare any troops from New Orleans.

Next, what am I doing? I have begun a new canal it will take three months to finish with good management and good luck. But already I've been obliged to divert a portion of my laboring force to convert the canal already cut into a defensive work, for Rumour says the rebels are going to try to interrupt the work by land attack. Not unlikely at all, if our fleet does not destroy their ram. Then, I'm embarrassed by the excessive number of sick in my fighting force. Twelve hundred on the sick list, some eight hundred others about, unequal from the effects of malaria to any vigorous exertion of mind or body. On paper, my force numbers some 3000, in fact, for service, it is doubtful if under the greatest emergency, I could get together 1000 men able to fight for hours and march a dozen miles. This is a dilemma, is it not?

Commodore Farragut and fleet has received orders to go down the river to New Orleans. I am cooperating with him. Commodore Davis and fleet are on the opposite side of the bend above Vicksburg. The latter are to remain in charge of the river. Part of Davis' fleet will have to occupy both sides of the bend, and communicate by land, $1\frac{1}{4}$

² The writer's wife's mother.

miles across the bend, with each other. They ought to have a railroad track, which it is quite possible to make out of the rails from the Vicksburg, Shreveport and Texas rail road which runs through our midst. I'm so anxious to do something useful, that I've half a mind to undertake the work, notwithstanding my alarmingly large and fast increasing sick list, and my desire and prayer to win, if we have to fight. So we go! The country's circumstances require everything, every energy to carry it safely through the war.

But emancipation and confiscation must do much to end the war. Or what can the south expect but a servile insurrection! If the war continues a year longer, nothing can save them from it. The idea of freedom has possessed itself of the entire black population, and what idea of this sort ever failed to work itself out? The old and decrepit are not exempt from it, and leave the comforts age and infirmity require for freedom. Here they are in our lines, old, young; men, women; boys, girls; rampant with the idea of being free, look and speak defiantly to their quondam masters.

Yes, a year's longer war, and negro slavery is doomed forever. And they whose ambition led them to attempt the foundation of a great slave empire are in danger of domination by the former slave, under the terrors and humiliations of perhaps a Black Republic! How Providence works let no man pretend to say. But this looks like retribution.

BATON ROUGE, July 26.

To Mrs. M. N. Williams.

Ten precious letters from May 31 to July 2 met me on my arrival from Vicksburg today. One envelope contains a missive of announcement and congratulation with a lock of hair from baby, by Cousin P. and a special announcement from you.

My transports came down convoyed by all of Commodore Farragut's fleet, expecting to have to run a gauntlet of art'y and musketry all the way through. But to our surprise and greater comfort not a shot was fired, because they saw us so well prepared to return their fire.

Rumours have been various and rife of the enemy's intentions on Baton Rouge. At one time 15,000 men reported to be within 8 miles. My force which came down the river has augmented the force here, more numerically than effectively, on account of the great number of sick. But still, to all here, its arrival must be comforting.

I confess I'm glad to get back from swamps and malaria to something civilized in aspect and civilized in fact. We, the army, have some good friends and courteous here, people too humane to encourage civil war, and too much attached to the Union to aid its enemies by their money or services. Yet there is that *Conscription* which thousands would evade if they could and thousands are contributing to against their will. Yes, that Conscription which makes the war the cause of the South, by bringing by force every southern man capable of bearing arms into the war. And, once in arms, it matters little how they get there, they will according to all experience on the subject fight as well as conscripts as they would as volunteers—yea better. For, as conscripts, the only relation between the private in the ranks and the officer is a purely official relation, which exacts discipline and compels instruction without fear, favor or affection. This result is not attainable with volunteers, raised and brought into service as ours are, with

their political and party connections retained in full force—their hopes of preferment to civil office urging them to be popular rather than faithful, holding out the prospect of advancement to the man who neglects his duty most—the demagogue who is trying to serve himself rather than his country.

I am not mistaken in my assertion that we ought to adopt the conscription, and then we may count on beating down rebellion and restoring the union. Our volunteer system is radically bad, and must be set aside, and the sooner set aside the better. This is the truth, and in this crisis of our country nothing but the truth will save us. Lying politicians and lying newspapers have brought the country to its present extremity. Brave and true men only will save it. Let us be true to our country, and true to ourselves, then may we, with hope that we shall be heard, ask God to help us.

While writing this, I'm interrupted by a shining, ebony face and profound salutation, in a little voluble man who calls himself Baptiste Charles. Baptiste Charles has a large watermelon in both hands which he comes to present to me—which I persuade Charles to accept a quarter of a dollar for. Charles asserts his loyalty to the north and proclaims the secession sentiments of his master. I do not discuss Constitutional questions with Baptiste Charles, but tell him his melon is an uncommonly fine one, and that if he has cantelopes or figs, or fruit or eggs, or vegetables of any sort to sell, to bring them in. Charles bows profoundly, for be it remembered that Charles is a French negro, and has the politeness of that nation.

July 27, Sunday. Good bye, my own wife. Love to Cousins. Kisses to J. M. S. and X.³

[This concludes the letters. There was probably no further opportunity to send, if there had been leisure to write. The enemy's advance was known, and there was disaffection in the city. The good-bye written July 27 was a last one. G. M. W.]

³ General Williams's youngest son was born June 28, 1861.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Science of Jurisprudence: a Treatise in which the Growth of Positive Law is Unfolded by the Historical Method and its Elements Classified and Defined by the Analytical. By HANNIS TAYLOR, LL.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. lxxv, 676.)

MR TAYLOR tells us (p. 31): "The primary purpose of that branch of the Historical Method known as Comparative Politics is to classify and label the outer shells of states as represented by their political constitutions; the primary purpose of that branch of the same method known as Comparative Law is to classify and label the interior codes under which rights recognized by law are enforced by state authority . . . No matter whether we look to the ancient or modern world, it appears that Comparative Law has ever been the subsidiary science which collects the data to which the science of jurisprudence has been and must be applied."

In view of this statement it is surprising to find nearly one-half of the book devoted to the description of political institutions, which are only remotely, if at all, relevant to the subject indicated by the title. What is called the External History of English Law, covering no less than 272 pages, is nothing but an outline of the growth of the British constitution; the foundation of our own national constitution, especially as foreshadowed in an "epoch making tract" of Pelatiah Webster (printed in full in the appendix) occupies the chapter entitled English Law in the the United States; while under the curious title Roman and English Law Combined we get chiefly an account of the Latin American governments.

Mr. Taylor's theory seems to be that private law cannot be understood without a thorough comprehension of political institutions. "If it be true that law proper is such only when it is enforceable as a command emanating from the corporate person of the state, acting through that organ in which the sovereign power is vested, it follows that the state, as a living and growing organism, should be so analyzed by the jurist as to lay bare all of its organs and their functions" (p. 503). An obvious fallacy; as well might it be said that we cannot study the law of corporations without studying the state, since the corporation is the creature of the state. The production and enforcement of private law

is but one of many functions of the state, and to its political factors generally quite a secondary function. If the jurist is interested in government except as it bears directly upon private law, it is because government is a distinct province of life in which the idea of law expresses itself; the problems of law in this province, however, and in most countries the methods and organs of its development, have been so different from those of private law, that a conventional differentiation has taken place, according to which jurisprudence has become associated with the science of private law.

For the "unfolding of the growth of positive law by the historical method" we turn to ch. III. entitled External History of Roman Law. Down to the codification of Justinian this offers a readable account of a familiar topic; the continuation of the history of the civil law in continental Europe contains some valuable material not otherwise easily accessible to English or American readers. As a summary of existing legal systems this latter portion of the chapter challenges comparison with Renton and Phillimore's corresponding chapter in their recent work on Colonial Laws and Courts, which is more complete. The omission of any mention of the new Swiss Civil Code with the valuable notes of its draftsman—in themselves a first-class treatise on jurisprudence—seems unpardonable. Had Mr. Taylor expanded this part of his book by sacrificing other material not having a legitimate place in it, he would have placed his readers under obligation.

In a chapter of 94 pages entitled Law Proper or State Law, Mr. Taylor attempts to present an analysis of law and of legal relations and a classification of the divisions of the law. The treatment of the various topics is uneven, and in some cases (*e. g.*, quasi-contract and administrative law) inadequate. The observations on remedial law and the sources of law are on the whole the most satisfactory part of this chapter. We have, however, to note the unaccountable misstatement that "in nearly all the states of the Union carefully prepared codes have appeared in which is restated, on the Roman plan, in titles, chapters, and sections, the entire body of law of the particular state, resting everywhere, except in Louisiana, upon an English basis" (p. 517).

The author's view of the nature of international law is indicated by the fact that he treats of it as under the head of Law by Analogy. In this connection we also find very unexpectedly a brief discussion of the composite types of state organization. The closing chapter on International Rules to Prevent Conflict of Laws belongs to the most satisfactory portions of the book. However, in view of the long list of writings, some of them of quite second-rate importance, which the author enumerates, it is surprising that he has not a word to say about the Hague Conferences of 1893, 1894 and 1900, surely the most noteworthy recent development in the history of international private law.

On the whole, the book is not sufficiently systematic, complete, or

accurate to serve the purpose of an elementary treatise on jurisprudence. Nor does it succeed, on the other hand, in contributing to the solution of fundamental problems or even in presenting them in a new light. Coming from an author of such distinguished reputation as Mr. Taylor enjoys, the impression which the work leaves is one of disappointment. A timely essay might be written on the topic "of the vocation of eminent lawyers for the science of jurisprudence".

E. F.

General History of Western Nations from 5000 B. C. to 1900 A. D.

By EMIL REICH, Doctor Juris. Volumes I. and II. *Antiquity*. (London and New York: Macmillan and Company. 1908. Pp. xxvi, 485; x, 479.)

THE author's idea of his subject is the most interesting feature of the present work, and may be briefly stated as follows. General history is not a summary of special histories, as is ordinarily assumed, but a study of large facts. "At the basis of all that happened in the history of western nations there is a series of some twenty to thirty general facts, which singly, and still more by meeting, blending, or antagonizing one another, created a multitude of particular facts." The treatment of these general truths in the present volumes is not philosophy, which depreciates teleological reasoning; it is rather psychology in that it has to do with motive as a primary cause. In this respect the author claims his work to be superior to that of other historians, among whom "it is not considered good form to try to know more than one's sources, which is precious little." The chief contents of history, he continues, are institutions, events and persons. Because of the static character of institutions we are in a position to know them much better than the other two elements, and must therefore make them the basis of our study. Institutions repeat themselves, though persons and events do not. It is possible for us accordingly by the direct study of some modern institution, analogous to one of ancient times, to find a means of getting into closer touch with the real psychological essence of the earlier institution. The only way to gain this knowledge of present conditions is by long sojourns in the countries in which they exist. Most historians are of the "arm-chair" type; they are utterly impractical, their vision is narrow, and they are hampered by their philological method.

In his treatment of events and their relation to institutions he contests the theory represented by Eduard Meyer and Seignobos that history is a chain of accidents. It is in fact, he asserts, the science of correlations, which are affected by chance occurrences no more than comets and meteors affect the regularity of the solar system. A correlation is the psychological motive underlying two or more historical phenomena and bringing them into unity. The history of the

world is such a unit, the paramount current of which is "the Europeanisation of mankind. In the present year eleven hundred out of a total of over fifteen hundred million human beings are under the sway of Europeans or their direct descendants." The primary factor in this process is Hellenic civilization, to which must be added two others of less importance, Roman polity, and Christianity. Of Teutonism, so prominent in all our histories, he makes nothing, in the conviction that race does not count appreciably as a historical force. Even Hellenic culture was not the creation of a race as such but of a peculiar environment.

In looking for causes more general than the twenty or thirty facts referred to above, and more elementary than the three just mentioned, Dr. Reich discovers five, which he terms correlative forces. The first, and in the early stage of a nation's progress most prominent, is geopolitics. In explanation of this cause he states that it is not the configuration of the country alone which makes a people, but much more the configuration of neighboring countries. The growth of a state is largely the result of conflict. "France has ever since the last of the Merovingian kings been the most exposed large country of Europe. By sea and on land powerful enemies have been constantly threatening the French, thus producing that French alertness and quickness of intellect, that tendency to centralised, that is, ever-ready government which is vainly ascribed to some 'Gallic' or 'Celts-Latin' race quality." The second great force is the production and distribution of wealth—not all-powerful, however, as many historians have assumed. The third is the relation of man to woman. The conservative influence of women may be illustrated by the contrast between stagnant Sparta and progressive Athens. The fourth cause is personality, and the fifth is ideals.

In these two volumes, with which he begins his general history of Western nations, he applies to the development of antiquity the principles enumerated above. The work is not a history in the usual sense, but a succession of essays on some of the larger aspects of the period treated. The discursive style arises from the circumstance that the method is essentially comparative. In the treatment of details the author often falls into grave errors, which might have been avoided, had he taken an "arm-chair" historian into partnership in his labor. Long periods are represented by meagre summaries. Many subjects, like the reform movement begun by the Gracchi, are inadequately treated. The author gives little space to the imperial period of Roman history, and his ideas of individual emperors are largely antiquated. For living and earlier scholars who are ordinarily considered pre-eminent in the field he expresses profound contempt, while extolling himself as the creator of the only true historical method. Notwithstanding these disagreeable features the work proves the author to possess some constructive ability. His synthetic principles, though

extravagantly stated and not so new as he claims, are worthy of attention.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

The Imperial Gazetteer of India: the Indian Empire. Volume II. Historical. Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1908. Pp. xxxv, 573. New edition.)

THE history of the development of this work goes back a little over a quarter of a century to the time when Sir W. W. Hunter published his *Indian Empire* with the intention of "distilling into one volume the essence of the *Imperial Gazetteer*". The second edition of the *Gazetteer* was followed by a new and revised edition of the *Indian Empire* (1892) which like the work upon which it was based had expanded about fifty per cent., but still remained the work of one man. It is characteristic of the advance of scholarship in the last fifteen years that the companion to the third edition of the *Gazetteer* should be broken into four volumes each requiring for its completion the co-operation of a number of specialists. The companion volumes bearing the subtitles, *Descriptive*, *Economic*, and *Administrative*, appeared in 1907 and constitute with the present volume what is in reality a new work, a fact which should however not make its users oblivious of their indebtedness to the first author of the *Indian Empire*.

To indicate briefly the contents of the work: the first chapter (pp. 1-88) deals with epigraphy and is the work of Dr. J. F. Fleet. In the three following chapters Mr. Vincent A. Smith treats of the pre-historic antiquities (pp. 89-100), the history of sculpture and painting (pp. 101-134), and (pp. 135-155) the coinage of India. Architecture (pp. 156-201) is the subject of Dr. James Burgess's contribution. In the sixth chapter (pp. 206-269) Professor A. A. Macdonell gives an outline of Sanskrit literature. The political history of India before the Muhammadan Conquest is divided between Mr. Vincent A. Smith who treats of the history of northern India from 600 B. C. to A. D. 650 (pp. 270-302), Mr. James Kennedy who continues the narrative from 650-1200 (pp. 303-320), and Mr. Robert Sewell whose subject (pp. 321-349) is the history of Southern India. The tenth chapter, Muhammadan India (pp. 350-413), is the work of Mr. William Irvine, and is followed by an exceedingly interesting sketch (pp. 414-438) of the Vernacular Literature by Dr. G. A. Grierson. The editor, Mr. J. S. Cotton, contributes a short account (pp. 439-445) of the Marāthās; and the last two chapters of the book, Early European Settlements (pp. 446-469), and History of British Rule (pp. 470-530), while revised by Mr. P. E. Roberts, have been allowed to retain the personal impress of Sir W. W. Hunter.

As this sketch indicates, the work is a storehouse of valuable information in a most highly condensed form. Detailed criticism is pre-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—22.

cluded both by the wide range of subjects treated and by the limitations of space. But while recognizing the general merits of the book it may be permitted to signalize as of special value the chapters by Dr. Grierson, Dr. Burgess, and Dr. Fleet; the last both because of its sound valuation of the sources of Indian history, and because of its stimulating suggestions of new lines of research. The historical chapter by Mr. Smith is a skilful condensation of his *Early History of India*, previously reviewed in this journal; and Professor Macdonell's article bears a similar relation to his excellent *History of Sanskrit Literature*.

One point on which the reviewer would differ from the last scholar is of sufficient general interest to be mentioned here. Professor Macdonell roughly dates the first two periods of Vedic literature between 1500 B. C. and the time of Buddha. To me it seems that Winternitz is correct in saying that Buddhism presupposes the Vedāṅgas as well as the Brāhmanas and Samhitās, that the beginning of the period is entirely undefined, so that the best date is $x-500$, with the probability that this must be changed to $x-800$, and that x falls in the third not the second millenium before our era. Recent investigations are pointing to a greater age of the Avesta than has generally been assumed and this result cannot fail to have its bearing upon the date of the Vedas.

Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique, Celtique et Gallo-Romaine.

Par JOSEPH DÉCHELETTE, Conservateur du Musée de Roanne.
Volume I. *Archéologie Préhistorique*. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1908. Pp. xix, 747.)

THERE has been for some time need of a general treatise on Gaulish archaeology. Investigation has made rapid progress in recent years, and the literature of the subject has become very extensive and in some measure difficult of access. A co-ordinating survey of the field has thus become increasingly necessary not only for archaeologists themselves, but hardly less for historians and philologists who are constantly concerned with the results of archaeological research. M. Déchelette has undertaken to supply the want in a manner at once comprehensive and thorough. His *Manuel* is to be in three volumes, of which only the first, dealing with the Stone Age, has now appeared. The second will cover the Age of Bronze and the earlier part of the Iron Age—that is, the period of Celtic occupation down to the invasion of Caesar; and the third will take up the Gallo-Roman epoch.

The opening chapters of the first volume expound the aims and methods of archaeological investigation and describe briefly the geological eras which precede the appearance of man. Then a chapter is devoted to a discussion of man's existence in the Tertiary Age. Nine chapters follow, dealing with the successive phases of palaeolithic culture from the earliest alluvial remains to the epoch of the reindeer and the

cave-dwellers. The sites of important excavations are passed in review and the evidences they yield concerning climate, fauna and flora, human implements and utensils, and general manners of living. In a separate chapter the human racial types of the Quaternary period are discussed in detail. Then in the second general subdivision of the volume the features of neolithic culture are examined at similar length: the new types of habitations, the great stone monuments, the smaller relics of art and manufacture, and the character of the races that produced them all. Two extensive appendixes furnish carefully classified geographical lists of the caves of the "âge du renne" and of the stations and "ateliers" of the Neolithic Age.

Such is the range of M. Déchelette's first volume. In method of treatment it is skilfully adapted to the needs both of the archaeologist in search of detail information and of the layman desirous of guidance and orientation. For the benefit of the latter class of readers the methods of archaeological investigation are fully expounded and illustrated and elementary explanations (such as the meaning of "megalith" or of the "cephalic index") are freely supplied. Although the systematic account is confined to Gaulish territory, frequent comparisons are made with conditions existing in other parts of the world. The exposition is nearly always lucid and often full of interest, and the value of the book is much enhanced by numerous illustrations.

The work may be pronounced without question a trustworthy guide to the wide and difficult field of science with which it deals. Being rather encyclopaedic than original in purpose, it will not be expected to contain novelties either of fact or theory. But it will be found to exhibit in a high degree thoroughness of scholarship and sobriety of judgment. In dealing with unsettled questions, such as the problem of early Oriental influences (pp. 217 ff., 313 ff., 339 ff., 424 ff.), the nature of primitive magic and religion (pp. 224 ff., 236-237) the supposed hiatus between palaeolithic and neolithic culture (pp. 312 ff.), or the purpose of the great cromlechs and stone circles (pp. 447 ff.), M. Déchelette presents arguments impartially and states his conclusions cautiously, where indeed he does not withhold decision entirely. It should be added that although the volume stops far short of historical time, it treats of many subjects which vitally concern students of the literature and institutions of later ages.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Histoire de la Gaule. Par CAMILLE JULLIAN, Professeur au Collège de France. Volume II. *La Gaule Indépendante.* (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1908. Pp. 557.)

THE second volume of M. Jullian's history is almost entirely descriptive or expository in character. The movements of the early population of Gaul and the course of the Celtic conquest having been traced in the first volume, the author now deals with the period of

Celtic occupation down to the beginning of Roman rule. He surveys with admirable thoroughness the political and social organization of Gaul in the era of its independence, and takes up every phase of public or private life concerning which any record has been preserved. As a collection of materials and a source of information the volume is decidedly better than any other book on the subject, though in a field where so many things are matters of individual interpretation it can hardly be expected wholly to supersede previous treatises, some of which have been written from quite different points of view.

In the investigation of the earlier period M. Jullian had to occupy himself largely with questions of anthropology and archaeology, and his doctrines have not all met the approval of the experts in those sciences. Some of his unorthodox views—his “*panligurisme*”, as it has been called, and his theory with regard to the Bronze Age—appear again in the second volume, or at least underlie a portion of the discussion. But for the most part here he is concerned with evidence derived from the classical historians or from inscribed monuments, and of all these things he has a thorough first-hand knowledge. Moreover in handling his material, in the organization, criticism and presentation of it, he proves himself an historian of breadth and power. Where the subject permits it, as in the descriptions of daily life, he makes good use of a vivid imagination; he always writes with sympathy, and sometimes with an enthusiasm which recalls the neo-druidical historians of a past generation. But he is saved from their extravagances by his good sense and by his superior knowledge of other civilization parallel to that of which he writes. Thus he comments sensibly (p. 159) both on the traditional exaltation of the druidical order and on the extravagant abuse which they received at the hands of classical historians. Again, after expounding the possible symbolism in the cult of the mistletoe very much as Henri Martin used to interpret it (though in less rhapsodical terms), he dismisses the subject with a word of caution: “*Mais cela n'est qu'une hypothèse, et peut-être, en le faisant, cède-t-on trop au désir de donner à la religion druidique le charme attrayant d'une morale poétique*” (p. 169).

On the whole, though by no means lacking in originality or independence, M. Jullian exhibits a caution suited to the difficulties of his subject. But occasionally this very quality has betrayed him into dangers opposite to those he sought to escape. He refuses, for example, to complete and interpret the testimony of ancient historians by the aid of evidence derived from Welsh and Irish documents of the Christian era; and there is a manifest advantage in keeping the ancient, contemporary evidence by itself, unmixed with any of later date. He is probably wise in thus restricting his field. But it is one thing to leave a body of testimony aside, for good and sufficient reasons, and it is another thing to repudiate it. And M. Jullian certainly goes too far when he questions the pertinency of the records of the insular

Celts, and makes use by preference of the meagre, classical accounts of the ancient Germans (p. 14). This is to attach too little significance to the community of speech which even in his dubious re-classification of the Celtic language (p. 365) he does not undertake to deny. Moreover it is not true, as he maintains, that the similarities between Gaulish institutions and those of the insular Celts are only such as can be pointed out between Gauls and Germans or Greeks or even peoples still more remote. The parallels are too numerous and significant to be dismissed in this fashion, and in some cases, if M. Jullian had taken them into account, they might have modified his interpretation of the evidence concerning Gaul. Insular conditions, for example, are not without their bearings on the origin of Continental druidism (pp. 88, 116), or on the existence of a Gaulish mythology (p. 148), or even on the apparent lack of a Gaulish drama (p. 382); and it should also be borne in mind that if, on the one hand, the Welsh and Irish documents are late and semi-Christian, they have, to offset this, the value of direct testimony, whereas the classical accounts of Gaul are almost entirely the work of foreigners, and are none too explicit at that.

In a work for which the materials are, after all, scanty and of such doubtful meaning, it is inevitable that there should be differences of opinion not only concerning general methods but also concerning many particular conclusions. M. Jullian, in recognizing the existence of a general Gaulish pantheon (pp. 98, 118, 151), takes issue (justifiably, in the opinion of the present reviewer) with a doctrine which has been gaining ground of late among French scholars. In his discussion of the "Matres" (p. 135) he also departs from received opinion, but with less good reason. His description of them as divinities of springs and fountains ("mères fontainières") appears to rest chiefly upon a doubtful etymology of certain epithets. M. Jullian's explanation of "Lugdunum" (p. 252) is by no means obviously preferable to that which associates it with the god *Lug*. His statements concerning the linguistic unity of Gaul (p. 366) are more positive than are warranted by the meagre remains of Gaulish speech. (Contrast Thurneysen's remarks in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, II. 541.) But all these are at least defensible opinions, presented by the author, perhaps, with full knowledge of the objections that lie against them; and the limits of this review will not permit the mention of other such matters of dispute. Very little in the volume can be set down as positively erroneous, though it is hard to characterize otherwise the statement (p. 365) that there is no evidence before the thirteenth century to show the structure of the insular Celtic languages.

F. N. ROBINSON.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Constitutional History of England. A Course of Lectures delivered by F. W. MAITLAND, LL.D., late Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1908. Pp. xxviii, 547.)

ONE cannot take up the book in which are printed the lectures on English constitutional history written by Maitland in the winter of 1887-1888 without asking involuntarily whether he is to undergo the fate of Stubbs and to have published a mass of class-room lectures, never intended to see the light, and which he never would have consented to publish without the editing so evidently needed. It takes but little reading, however, to relieve one of the fear. The surprising thing about the book is that it contains so little that Maitland himself would have changed, or materially modified if he had rewritten these lectures twenty years later. That there are some statements that would have been changed, as for instance that on page 157 about the apportionment of military service after the Conquest, is no doubt true, but the lectures are in many things almost an advance programme of Maitland's later work. Again and again in the pages devoted to the first period, the field of his life study, we come upon a brief statement of the ideas elaborated in later works, at that date not even planned. Many of these passages are pointed out by Mr. Fisher, and it suffices to say of the editor's work in this case that it is wholly admirable both in what it says and in what it refrains from saying. The publication also fully justifies itself. It will be of great advantage to the teacher of English constitutional history to have in compendious form, accessible to his students, and easy to be understood, the results of Maitland's work, for this is practically what the book is, notwithstanding the date of the lectures.

Maitland's work upon the medieval constitutional history of England represents a distinct advance over that of Stubbs. This is true both of many details, and, of what is of greater importance, the general conception of the whole subject and of its relations. English constitutional history in his hands is freed entirely from the theory, which Stubbs could never wholly shake off, of a pure Teutonic community developing its institutions naturally without decisive influence from abroad. This Maitland does not do by substituting another general theory in the place of the one abandoned. He does it by studying the constitution in and for itself with little reference to the original sources of institutions, and little use of foreign analogies. The process is a thoroughly scientific and necessary one, and the result is large building on the foundations laid down by Stubbs. It cannot fail to bring materially nearer the time when the English constitution can be put into its proper relation with the Continental constitutions which were forming at the same time. That this needs to be done is evident. The limita-

tions on feudalism described on pp. 161-163, for instance, where they do not need to be modified in statement, are characteristic in greater or less degree of almost every feudal state, and the only peculiarity of England is that which is due to the stronger kingship. When the English constitution is put completely into these relations another step forward in its understanding will be taken.

The lectures were constructed on the plan of what may be called cross-sections at five important points of the history of the constitution: 1307; 1509; 1625; 1702; and 1887. These are not, however, mere cross-sections. They are points from which the view especially runs back over the past and observes growth and change, but where also the lines of connection with the future are made plain. On the general constitutional history of these periods after the first, disregarding the narrower history of the law, Maitland did not write again so fully as here. These portions of the book have, therefore, a peculiar value and are especially welcome. They show abundantly the peculiarities of Maitland's work in his especial field: a sure discernment of the really essential, lucid statement, fresh interpretation, and stimulating views.

Regarded as a text-book Maitland's *History of the Constitution* will fall into a class with Medley, not with Taswell-Langmead. It will be likely to strike the student as a history of the development of details, of separate institutions, rather than of the constitution as a whole. If he gains from its study any clear conception of the historical building up of the Anglo-Saxon type of government, as that has come to prevail in the world, he will get it from the supplementary work of the teacher rather than from the book. For the study of this side of constitutional history Taswell-Langmead still remains the best text-book, notwithstanding the inadequate editing it has received. It needs to be supplemented with some other book, however, and Maitland will probably make a better combination with it, one less difficult for the ordinary undergraduate to manage, than Medley. It will also be surprising if it is not found to be more interesting to the student than either of the other books. Certainly the instructor can further the interests of future scholarship in no better way than by making his advanced students familiar with this book.

GEORGE B. ADAMS.

Die Geschichte des Englischen Pfandrechts. Von Dr. jur. HAROLD DEXTER HAZELTINE, Reader in English Law an der Universität Cambridge. [Untersuchungen zur Deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, herausgegeben von Dr. OTTO GIERKE, Professor der Rechte an der Universität Berlin.] (Breslau: M. and H. Marcus. 1907. Pp. xxviii, 372.)

THIS valuable and scholarly work on the English law of gage or pledge represents the gathering together and presentation in comprehensive form of several articles and monographs in English and Ger-

man, together with much new material, by Dr. Hazeltine as a contribution to Gierke's well-known series of research works on German governmental and legal history. As the work is intended for German rather than English readers the more special discussion of the English *Pfandrechts* is prefaced by an interesting general survey of the governmental, economic and legal background of English medieval law. This survey concludes with a discussion of the growth of the law of personal and proprietary actions and of real and movable property, together with a brief summary of the sources and literature of medieval and early modern English law. There are also two brief chapters explaining the terminology of English *Pfandrechts* as derived from the sources.

The main portion of the treatise consists of a detailed examination of the origin and growth of the pledge or gage idea and of its various and complex applications in later procedure in England. The subject-matter is arranged in two books, the first covering the Anglo-Saxon period and the second the period from the Norman Conquest to the close of the Middle Ages. The first part of book I. consists of a careful and painstaking discussion of the formal oath or pledge, with or without some security, as found in Anglo-Saxon society. Following this in the second part of book I. is an extended account of the Anglo-Saxon law and practice in regard to movable property as pledges, while the third and concluding part takes up the gage of land before the Conquest under the two main heads of usufruct-gage (*Nutzpfand*) and property-gage (*Proprietätspfand*). In book II. dealing with the later medieval period of English legal development a more extended treatment is given of the formal oath and pledge of faith, and the early development of the law in regard to debt and contract is noticed under the chapter headings of Simple Contract and Contract under Seal. Parts II. and III. of book II. take up the law of movable gages and of the gage of land. Emphasis is placed on the growth of various forms of the gage and in particular on the origin and development of the "Hypothek" or mortgage principle by which the land gaged for a loan is left in possession of the debtor until default is made. This is regarded by Dr. Hazeltine as of later origin than the gage with immediate possession to the creditor, and he traces the history of this form of security from the early "Jewish Gage" in England through the statute law and recognizances to the modern law of mortgages. The excellent organization of the whole work gives unity and force to the author's conclusions that in the medieval law of usufruct-gage and property-gage is to be found those principles of security that govern the law of mortgages to-day.

As an appendix to the work there is a collection of source extracts illustrative of the gage of land in medieval England. There is also an excellent bibliography and index. One is surprised, however, that nowhere in the work is to be found mention of Dr. Gross's *Sources and*

Literature of English History which has been out now for some seven or eight years.

N. M. TRENHOLME.

The Making of Ireland and its Undoing, 1200-1600. By ALICE STOPFORD GREEN. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1908. Pp. xvi, 511.)

THIS is a refreshing book. Among the many woes of unfortunate Ireland not the least has been the character of her historians. The patient, moderate, judicious, learned historian has for the most part simply passed poor Ireland by.

Signs have not been wanting lately that this period of neglect or mistreatment is approaching its close, and that the history of Ireland may receive as serious attention as that of other countries. Toward this consummation Mrs. Green's book is another step. Its principal contents are a vast number of quotations from contemporary sources describing the considerable development of Irish agriculture, trade, manufactures, and intellectual and artistic life in the Middle Ages, and the decay and destruction of these, due to the policy and the wars of the Tudor sovereigns, in the sixteenth century. The fifteenth century, a period which the English historians have generally treated as a specially dark age in Irish history, since it was the age when English power in Ireland was at its lowest ebb, is looked upon by Mrs. Green as a period of culmination of many elements of a truly native civilization. The relations of Ireland, economic and intellectual, were largely with the continent of Europe rather than with England. Many Irish chieftains who had no knowledge of the English language and were therefore looked upon by their conquerors as barbarians, nevertheless were well trained in Latin, and often spoke French or Spanish as well. More Irish scholars studied and travelled on the Continent than in England. An interesting list is given of translations from Latin, French, Spanish and English into Irish. It is also of extreme interest to get the glimpse we do of the relations of Irish chieftains and merchants with the Continent along commercial lines, and of the ancient *aonachs*, half-political gatherings, half-provincial fairs. A much more favorable comparison of the Irish land and judicial systems with the English is here made than that which has been most usual. The quotations from Irish patriot-bards and singers of the country's sorrows are most impressive.

No one can read the statements of Mrs. Green and the contemporary records on which they are based without the feeling that the native resources and achievements of Ireland belong on a much higher plane than they have been traditionally placed; and that the ignorant, selfish and generally inept policy of England in the sixteenth century brought about vast misery and permanent loss to Ireland and the world. Nevertheless, one may not agree—the cautious scholar certainly will not agree—with the author in her extreme estimate of these same achievements

and losses. One may feel tolerably sure he is dealing with exaggerations when it is declared on one page that "every port in the circuit of Ireland was then filled with ships busy in the Continental trade", and, as an instance, four pages later, that at Carrickfergus "in one summer three barks of 40 tons apiece discharged their loading of excellent good Gascoigne wine". One may have quite a realizing sense of the incapacity and ill-judgment shown in the long story of English misgovernment of Ireland, and yet doubt whether there was such a deep-laid and deliberate and wide-spread plot in the sixteenth century for the destruction of Ireland as is here attributed to the English sovereigns and their advisers and representatives in Ireland.

Mrs. Green has a loose habit of referring to periods centuries apart as if describing one particular age. Events of the years 1265, 1387 and 1565 are referred to in one space of eight lines; in another, we pass from 1565 back to 1233 without recognizing it, except by a marginal reference. It would certainly be far more impressive and more accurate if the author would chose a certain definite period and give a concrete and complete description of conditions during that period. Three centuries are too long a time to be treated as a historic unit.

Indeed it is the absence of constructive plan and definite statement that is the greatest weakness of Mrs. Green's historical work. We wander around in a maze of somewhat incoherent assertions and detached illustrations and receive a general impression rather than a set of clear notions. If the same material were more rigorously and more closely organized and the results more moderately stated the effect on scholars would certainly be deeper and more convincing and the impression made on the minds of more casual readers more clear and lasting. An equally serious defect is the lack of a bibliography. Certain enigmatic initials and abbreviations are constantly repeated but nowhere is there any statement of their meaning, or of the relative value as contemporary testimony of the sources which they represent. Certainly the general knowledge of the bibliography of Irish history, even by scholars, is not such as to enable an author to count on a familiarity with Irish historical sources as a matter of commonplace knowledge. Mrs. Green, in other words, gives her readers no real information as to what part of her narrative is solidly based, and what part is derived from doubtful or worthless testimony. But after all technical objections have been made this work must be recognized as being of serious value as a learned, original and sympathetic contribution to the history of Ireland.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Charles the Bold, Last Duke of Burgundy, 1433-1477. By RUTH PUTNAM. [Heroes of the Nations, edited by H. W. C. DAVIS.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1908. Pp. xiv, 484.)

As popular historical presentations, few equal the *Heroes of the Nations* series in the scholarly qualifications possessed by the authors therein. While in some cases the volume may be the first production of the writer, in most instances the authors have already won recognition. Not the least of these is Miss Ruth Putnam. As the author of *William the Silent* and *A Mediaeval Princess* she has made the history of the Low Countries more particularly her province than any American writer since Motley.

The present work is different in compass and character from the familiar *Life of Charles the Bold* by Kirk, of whose collection she has made use, and to whose "accuracy and industry", even when differing from his conclusions, she pays the tribute of praise.

In a peculiar sense the subject of Charles the Bold falls within a fortunate period for the historian. In the fifteenth century European historiography had passed beyond the era of medieval annals and chronicles and was beginning to be rich in historical memoirs. To be sure, the thirteenth century had intimations of this kind of literature in the writings of Villehardouin and Joinville. But from the death of the latter in 1317, to the re-awakening of the memoir during the reign of Charles V. through the services of Christine de Pisan, the marshal Boucicault and others, there was nearly three-quarters of a century of stagnation as far as this form of historical writing was concerned in France.

In Commynes and Olivier de la Marche Miss Putnam had copious and racy memoirs to draw from, and many of her lesser sources of information are little less interesting. The effect of such sources clearly appears, for whole pages and half-pages are filled with direct quotations from them. A rough calculation shows that approximately one-fifth of the book is made up of quotations and they are vivid, telling extracts which embellish the narrative and do not burden the page with unessential details. It should be added that the reference is always appended. Proportions are well maintained throughout, about one-third of the book being devoted to Charles's youth. His diplomacy and his wars are carefully treated, but one looks in vain for information about the working of the Burgundian administrative system and institutional organization. Perhaps the omission was deliberate and due to the belief that such matters were too technical for an *oeuvre de vulgarisation*.

On page 6 there is an observation to the effect that at Charles's baptism his father had the baptismal font draped in black silk, and Miss Putnam remarks in the note "Why mourning was used on this joyful occasion does not appear." The truth is that black was not a color of

mourning as yet throughout Europe, and even the wearing of the mourning costume was only just beginning. In England and Burgundy red was the color of mourning. In France the royal house wore white, as did the ancient Romans, whence Isabeau of Bavaria, who was at this time in mourning for Charles VI., was called *La Reine Blanche*. The wearing of black as a sign of mourning first obtained in Spain, from which it spread to Naples and in the first half of the sixteenth century over Italy. Catharine de' Medici was the first queen of France to wear it. The portrait of Catterina Sforza, wife of Giovanni de' Medici, represents her attired in black dress and head-dress, yet not as a sign of grief. As a matter of fact, Duke Philip of Burgundy was especially fond of black silks and black velours and this is all the explanation there is of the draping of the baptismal font.

There are twenty-eight cuts from contemporary originals, three battle plans, one map, and an excellent bibliography.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

The King over the Water. By A. SHIELD and ANDREW LANG.
(London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company.
1907. Pp. xiii, 499.)

THE House of Stuart in these modern days is adding still another to its many vicissitudes of fortune. The unfaltering devotion of its adherents, long since defeated in the fields of war and politics, has turned seriously to that of history, and here, at last, has achieved no small success. To aid in this redressing of the balance, we have been given in the same year two elaborate and favorable biographies of the "Old Pretender", that cited above, and Martin Haile's *James Francis Edward, the Old Chevalier* (Dutton, 1907). The first work is, by token of its authorship, a product of the "Andrew Lang factory", but any misgivings arising from this fact are allayed by Mr. Lang's frank statement that "most of the research, and almost all the writing, are Miss Shield's. My part has mainly been that of supervision and of condensation." We only wish that this part had been more rigorously performed. The thrusting in of details in their chronological places is, from the literary viewpoint, a grievous defect in the book. The narrative is continually broken by material which, if admitted, should take the form of notes. Mr. Haile's story is, in contrast, more direct and readable, but less critical and complete.

Of authorities Miss Shield gives (pp. 476-479) a strangely arranged and cited list, including "Walpole's George II.", "The Stuarts in Italy. Quarterly Review", "Historical MSS. Commission Reports", and "Local Histories: Italian. Vatican Library." The notes, however, are in good form, and the chief sources have been used—with one serious exception, "the whole mass of later Stuart Papers at Windsor, as far as they are still unpublished". These, being in editorial hands,

were inaccessible. Mr. Haile apparently suffers from the same misfortune, though one discovers the fact only by going through his notes. This situation is unfortunate. What is more perplexing to both readers and contemplating writers than a scholarly book which says not quite the last word?

Mr. Lang's chief interest was to vindicate James's character. He blames Thackeray's *Esmond* for the need of such defense, and in a brilliant passage (p. vii) declares that Thackeray's picture is "merely an unconscious reproduction . . . of Scott's chapters on Charles II., a fugitive sheltered at Woodstock after Worcester fight". It may be added that many persons confuse the two "pretenders", and visit the son's misdeeds upon the father. Scholars have, of course, escaped these errors, but for everybody the high integrity of James's character is now established. Nevertheless, not even Miss Shield can acquit him of ungenerous conduct during his engagement to Clementina Sobieska, whom he seemed quite ready to jilt at the very moment when she was risking everything for him. In their later troubles, the chief blame is rightly laid on Clementina. If James's temperament was difficult, hers was impossible, and it was absolutely necessary to exclude her from political affairs.

Detailed criticism of a long story of intrigue is obviously here impossible. One can only say that James's personal career is well set forth; that the pulling and hauling of Jacobite plotters, though narrated with some confusion in details, leave an effective total impression; but that the relations of the cause to general politics, and especially to Scottish politics, are inadequately traced. The best chapters—on James's share in "the 'Fifteen'"—show "his courage and resolution", but also his incapacity to plan or lead a desperate endeavor. On the other hand, the book leaves one almost convinced that this honest, loyal, tolerant and reasonable man would have stood by his guarantees of the church and the laws, and would not have failed in the rôle of a constitutional king.

JOSEPH PARKER WARREN.

England in the Seven Years' War: a Study in Combined Strategy.

In two volumes. By JULIAN S. CORBETT, LL.M., Lecturer in History to the Royal Naval War College. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1907. Pp. xi, 476; vii, 407.)

MR. CORBETT'S subject has a twofold justification. In the first place we have had hitherto no thoroughly adequate study of that department of the war which directly affected the destinies of three nations and three continents; and secondly, we are treated for the first time to an intimate appreciation of how Pitt really conducted it. It is not enough that judging from results we call Pitt an organizer of victory. Mr.

Corbett shows us exactly how brain and brawn accomplished those results.

Naturally a book with a limited object, such as this, labors under certain disadvantages. Mr. Corbett seldom allows us to look over French shoulders; and merely to study how one nation played the great game is dangerously conducive to distorted impressions. Very clearly are we shown that France's policy of the "naval defensive" was a largely determining factor in the issue as well as the character of the war; and Mr. Corbett believes rightly that to seek compensation in Germany for inevitable losses in America was, under the circumstances, excellent policy. But what we are apt to forget in reading his book is that the corruption and inefficiency of French administration, and the decline in the personnel of the army were not only the main reasons for the failure of that policy but the conditions which rendered Pitt's achievements possible. Thus while the author's assertion (I. 191) that "to say, as is often said, that his policy was to conquer Canada in America is entirely to misconceive it" is correct as far as it goes, Pitt's actual statement was indirectly true.

But the gravest objection to the book is its bias. It is too much to assert that France's policy of a fortified barrier in America was based on "fine-drawn arguments that had no real foundation (I. 12)". It would be more just to remain content with the admission that "the stubborn commercial spirit", later mentioned (I. 14), rendered a diplomatic arrangement almost impossible. Again, to overlook the sweeping demands of the British cabinet and write of an ultimatum in which "France gaily claimed the whole of the disputed territory" (I. 40) is to convey an erroneous impression of the whole negotiation. In dealing with Boscawen's blow in 1755, Mr. Corbett is almost ingenuous. "It would be only charitable", he declares (I. 67), "to remember the temptation to which she [England] was exposed by the incredible simplicity of her adversary." Then if we turn to his discussion of the Spanish question of 1761, we find him naïvely stating (II. 207) that "one more such attempt could hardly have given us a worse reputation". He is perhaps presenting the best excuse when he appeals to British precedent as justification for a secret blow (I. 46); but even here it is to be remembered that a negotiation for a peaceful settlement was still pending when the cabinet resolved upon Boscawen's instructions. The episode is, of course, one on which Continental writers almost invariably disagree with their British neighbors. But when Mr. Corbett writes that the English ministers were "playing the great game of war, and playing it correctly" (I. 46), he substitutes a "might-is-right" proposition for the broader question of when and how a war may properly begin. And this leads us to remark incidentally that Mr. Corbett's profound sense of strategy blinds him to the greatest merit which diplomacy possesses. "Every consideration", he writes (I. 3), "of diplomatic . . . operations must rest subservient to naval strategy."

Correct as this may be, strategically, and true as it is that international relations possessed little of the sanctity of legal regulation, the irresistible feeling that they were playing a dangerous hand was at the bottom of much of the English council's vacillation over Hawke. Throughout his treatment of foreign policy and the evolution of the war Mr. Corbett's historical judgment seems warped by his patriotism. We may question whether the strategic foresight with which he credits the Newcastle ministry (I. 83, 140) is evinced by any statement in the ministers' letters; and it is hard to endorse his estimate of Hardwicke (I. 33) if he were really, as the author alleges (I. 50-51), "the dominating brain of the administration". Equally strange is his high praise of Cumberland (I. 33) in view of the latter's record and appointments; and Anson's weighty contribution to the Minorca disaster (I. 134-135) is no less to be remembered than his subsequent success in redeeming himself. Mr. Corbett gives, in fact, the impression of wishing to rehabilitate the Newcastle administration without finding much justification for it himself. Rather than own frankly that many of these ministers proved their worth only after a man appeared at the helm who could stimulate and drive them, he struggles in vain against the contrast which most historians find in the conduct of the war before and after Pitt's elevation. Whether it be true or not that the project of invasion was anything more than a well-reasoned feint, Mr. Corbett certainly fails to exculpate Newcastle from neglect of Minorca. Later we find the author himself acknowledging (I. 102) that "the line of passage from Toulon ought to have been seized earlier", and he shows in the same connection how Newcastle for political reasons diminished the navy. Yet with all his negligence and vacillation Newcastle was not guilty in Mr. Corbett's opinion of "inability to grasp the situation" (I. 37)! Fortunately we have the author's own strictures—at a later period—on which we may base a more consistent estimate.

Mr. Corbett's enunciation of the broad outlines of Pitt's "system" (I. 187-191) are very instructive. Throughout his book the author's grasp of strategy compels our admiration. He vindicates Pitt's coastal operations from adverse criticism and shows in each case the object they were intended to attain and how well in general the policy worked. One exception which perhaps may strike the reader is the case of the Rochfort project, which Pitt carried through even after Cumberland's defeat, and against the soberer judgment of his colleagues. Since Richelieu's nervousness and the state of his army were all that tided England and Prussia over a very grave crisis, it is hard to resist the feeling that Pitt's decision was perilous. Indeed the fact that he himself appreciated the situation may be seen in his offer to cede Gibraltar to Spain—an important negotiation, which Mr. Corbett omits. Whether or when Pitt's policies were affected by political considerations is a question which Mr. Corbett refrains from discussing.

One of the most interesting features of the book is the description

of the British efforts to gain Canada and of how two of the three attempts were frustrated by the French policy of the naval defensive. Another feature of interest is the writer's criticism of commanders who failed. He acquits Loudoun of blame in the Louisbourg miscarriage and lays the responsibility upon the home-government (vol. I. ch. VII.); he defends Conflans's conduct at Quiberon (II. 57, 61-62); and he seems also to justify Montcalm's precipitate attack on the Plains of Abraham (I. 470-471). The idea that the latter "could not tell how large was the force before him" (I. 470) is a plausible explanation based probably on Admiral Holmes's assertion, quoted by Mr. Doughty. Among the new evidence adduced in the book we note particularly the cabinet minutes of 1755 and the citations from the Viri-Solar correspondence; while American readers will take peculiar interest in the letter which reveals Bedford's prophetic reasoning (II. 173).

In general it may be urged that Mr. Corbett is inclined to be weak wherever he leaves the beaten track of strategy and naval war. Perhaps the scholarly treatment of his main theme is that which makes defects in the political and diplomatic background the more patent. He shows, nevertheless, a clear understanding of constitutional questions, and his discussion of Pitt's downfall (II. 205-206) is admirable. In his treatment of Choiseul's first overtures Mr. Corbett differs considerably from M. Waddington, who believes in their sincerity; but it is difficult to see why if Pitt "wished to unmask the Franco-Spanish game" (II. 155), he could not best have done so by promptly accepting the proffered conditions. The author probably reaches the truth when he points out that Pitt's aim was to destroy entirely the sea-power of France (II. 143); hence his insistence upon her exclusion from the fisheries, and hence his general attitude toward the peace. Mr. Corbett argues also that Pitt might well have pacified Spain by a timely policy of conciliation (II. 207). On the whole it would seem that when people began to desire peace, the rôle of the great war minister had properly come to an end. We might suggest that Mr. Corbett's judgment of Pitt's and Newcastle's "loyalty to Frederick" should have been tempered somewhat by the results of Dr. von Ruville's researches; whereas his view of Bute is on the whole more convincing than that taken by the German scholar.

Despite some defects in style and a few grammatical errors the book is entertainingly written, and, as "a study in combined strategy", is excellent. While in certain respects it needs to be read with caution, the student will find it a valuable companion-piece to M. Waddington's depiction of the Continental phases of the struggle.

T. W. RIKER.

A Historical Geography of the British Colonies. By HUGH E. EGERTON, M.A., Beit Professor of Colonial History in the University of Oxford. Volume V. *Canada*. Part II. *Historical*. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1908. Pp. vii, 365.)

As the title indicates, this is one of a series of volumes on the *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*, planned and partly executed by Sir Charles Lucas, but which he found it impossible to finish. Professor Egerton deals with the British period of Canadian history, the French epoch having been treated in a previous volume of the series. The series is intended, primarily, for the advanced classes of secondary schools, and for such a purpose an exceptional amount of research is represented in the book before us.

Professor Egerton, in his preface, fully recognizes the difficulty of writing the history of a country, with the concrete conditions of which he is not familiar. But though evidences of this disadvantage are undoubtedly noticeable, yet, throughout the volume, there is constant evidence of an anxiety to obtain the most reliable information available, as well as of a scrupulous desire to be fair to the many conflicting interests which are represented in Canadian history.

So much in the earlier years of Canadian development depended upon the character and policy of the governors that they largely monopolize the historic stage during the first half of the nineteenth century. Yet most of the real problems of the country arose from the economic and social conditions which confronted the early settlers, but which have scarcely yet been sufficiently studied to bring out the true significance of the striking incidents in higher politics, or to permit always of the emphasis being placed in the proper quarter.

In the limited space of a small volume, only a bird's eye view of the leading events of Canadian history is possible. Yet Professor Egerton has maintained an admirable proportion in his treatment of the field assigned him, and has given his readers an introduction, at least, to the history of every portion of the large area now included in the Dominion of Canada. Thus, in chapter six, he introduces a sketch of the early western exploration which eventually opened up to British settlement the region lately divided between the new provinces of western Canada. On the other hand, he has recognized the comparative unimportance of the War of 1812, which, for lack of a better knowledge of the really vital factors in the country's development, has hitherto bulked so largely in Canadian histories. In his treatment of the stormy period from 1818 to 1840, the author, though sometimes perhaps misplacing the emphasis, yet manifests an admirable spirit of fairness in dealing with the bitter controversies between the government and the popular party. Book I., which covers the pre-Union period to 1841, closes with a chapter on the early history of the Maritime Provinces.

Book II. deals with the practical realization of the union of the two

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—23.

Canadas, now Ontario and Quebec, and the early operation of responsible government. After Lord Elgin's time, however, the government was gradually brought to a dead-lock through the mutual entanglement of party and racial forces, which completely frustrated the normal operation of the political party system, and consequently of responsible cabinet government. In his treatment of this period, Professor Egerton has devoted more attention to the great economic and social problems, such as trade, transportation and education, which, though always vital factors in Canadian history, at this period bulk more largely in the usual historic records. In chapter six, due attention is given to the conditions and negotiations which resulted ultimately in confederation and the establishment of the Dominion of Canada. This is appropriately followed by another chapter on the later development of the Northwest which, when added to federated Canada, rounded out the Dominion to its present dimensions. As this was finally accomplished through the inclusion of British Columbia in 1871, book II. closes with that date.

Book III., confined to the last seventy pages, deals very briefly with the Dominion of Canada from 1871 to the present time. Here we find merely an outline of such matters as the relations between Canada and the United States, including boundaries, reciprocal trade, and fisheries; the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; the tariff and protection. The relations between provincial and Dominion powers are passed in review, and the closing chapter of the volume gives a glimpse of present-day conditions.

A number of maps are distributed through the volume; but those purporting to represent the railways of the Dominion are most misleading. According to these there is in Canada but one railway and its connections—the Canadian Pacific Railway.

ADAM SHORTT.

[Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française, publiés par le Ministère de l'Instruction Publique]: *Département du Loiret, Cahiers de Doléances du Bailliage d'Orléans pour les États Généraux de 1789*. Publiés par CAMILLE BLOCH. Tomes I.-II. (Orléans: Imprimerie Orléanaise. 1907. Pp. lxxvi, 800, and ii, 515); *Département de la Marne, Cahiers de Doléances pour les États Généraux de 1789*. Publiés par GUSTAV LAURENT. Tome I. *Bailliage de Châlons-sur-Marne*. (Épernay: Imprimerie Henri Villers. 1906. Pp. xxxii, 872); *Département de Meurthe-et-Moselle, Cahiers de Doléances des Bailliages des Généralités de Metz et de Nancy pour les États Généraux de 1789*. 1^{re} Série, Tome I. *Cahiers du Bailliage de Vic*. Publiés par CHARLES ÉTIENNE. (Nancy: Imprimerie Berger-Levrault et Cie. 1907. Pp. xxxvi, 775);

Département de la Manche, Cahiers de Doléances du Bailliage de Cotentin (Coutances et Secondaires) pour les États Généraux de 1789. Publiés par ÉMILE BRIDREY. Tomes I.-II. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1907. Pp. 808 and 806); *Département de la Charente, Cahiers de Doléances de la Sénéchaussée d'Angoulême et du Siège Royal de Cognac pour les États Généraux de 1789.* Publiés par P. BOISSONNADE. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1907. Pp. 555.)

IN December 1903 a commission composed of well-known historians was appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction in France to undertake the publication of the sources relating to the economic history of the French Revolution. The objects and organization of this important enterprise, originally conceived and promoted by the well-known socialist, M. Jaurès, have been described by one of its leading members, M. Caron, in a recent issue of this REVIEW.¹ The chief attention of the commission has hitherto been directed to the publication of the *cahiers* of 1789, a celebrated mass of material of which only a very small portion, and that badly edited, has hitherto been available for students of the period. It will be remembered that the order convoking the Estates General, issued January 24, 1789, provided that the well-nigh obsolete *bailliages* (or *sénéchaussées*, as they were termed in parts of the kingdom), which had served as election districts when the estates last met in 1614, should not only send their deputies to Versailles but should draw up *le cahier de leurs plaintes et doléances*. The *cahiers*, Chérest surmises, were in the eyes of the government only a part of the ancient routine. Mounier went so far as to declare them an instrument of despotism, since they only served to assuage the growing discontent by permitting the people to pour out fruitless expostulations to which the king's ministers need pay no attention whatever. The task of drafting them was, however, taken very seriously on the whole throughout the kingdom and the desire the king had expressed that those even in the most remote and obscure regions of his realm should make their wishes and their grievances known to him was generously gratified. Voters belonging to the clergy and nobility were to appear in person or through representatives at the meeting held by each order in the "chief" *bailliages*, there to select deputies to the Estates General and to draft a *cahier* to be taken to Versailles. There are but seventy-five chief *bailliages* enumerated in the instructions issued by the government, January 24, 1789; accordingly, if we make no allowance for the numerous later modifications and inevitable anomalies, the *cahiers* of the privileged classes would not exceed one hundred and fifty. Those

¹ Volume XIII. 501ff. See also his more elaborate articles in *La Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, VI. 443ff, and VIII. 545ff. The activities of the commission and its successive circular instructions are carefully given in the well-known periodical, *La Révolution Française*.

drafted by the Third Estate had a far more complicated history and their number is variously estimated to have been forty or fifty thousand. Each parish, village and town was ordered to hold its primary assembly and draft its cahier. Some one hundred and forty larger places were enumerated in which the assembly which was to draft the cahier was to be composed of delegates chosen by the various corporations, industrial and otherwise. Although they were not explicitly required to do so, many of the corporations and guilds seized the opportunity to draw up each its particular cahier, which was later to be fused with the others into the general cahier of the town. To add to the complexity, many of the bailliages were classified as "secondary". Each of these held its own assembly of the delegates from the towns and parishes within bounds and fused the local cahiers into one, which was later taken to the assembly of the chief bailliage there to be fused with those of the other secondary bailliages and that of the chief bailliage.

To illustrate the situation we may take the contents of the two volumes that M. Bloch has prepared of the cahiers of the bailliage of Orleans. There are (1) the cahiers of the one hundred and sixty-nine parishes of the chief bailliage and of its five towns, excluding the city of Orleans itself. Next come (2) the cahiers of the forty-eight corporations of the city of Orleans—the several groups of local administrative officers, judges, lawyers, notaries, the university, the medical school, the Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, the apothecaries, printers, grocers, goldsmiths, tailors, cordwainers, butchers, bakers, boatmen of the Loire, etc., ending with the "habitants libres" who were not enrolled in any corporation. Representatives of these bodies together with those of four urban parishes, all bringing their appropriate cahiers, met to draw up the cahier of the city. This had later to be taken to a meeting of the deputies from the neighboring towns and rural parishes and combined with their cahiers into (3) the cahier of the chief bailliage. (4) In each of the six secondary bailliages an assembly was held for the consolidation of the cahiers submitted by the various villages and towns. The primary cahiers of the secondary bailliages are, however, M. Bloch believes, lost. Lastly (5) the cahiers of the chief bailliage and of the six secondary bailliages were combined into the definitive cahier of the Third Estate of Orleans to be presented, along with that of the clergy and of the nobility, to the king by the deputies chosen to sit in the Estates General at Versailles.

The first serious attempt to print the cahiers was made by the editors of the *Archives Parlementaires*. Partial as is this collection it fills over five large volumes, printed in double columns.² The editors ordinarily

² *Archives Parlementaires*, I.–VII. (1868–1875). Volume I. is devoted mainly to a general introduction to the French Revolution. Volume VII. is an analytical index where one will find, pp. 10–28, a list of all the cahiers that the editors included—and they claim to have included *intégralement* all that they could find. A second unimproved edition appeared in 1879. Considerable numbers of the cahiers were printed separately in 1789.

give only the three definitive cahiers of each chief bailliage, but a few of the parish cahiers—especially those coming from around Paris and from the neighborhood of Aix—are given, as well as several of those drawn up by the corporations. But the list of even the definitive cahiers is very incomplete. Brette estimates that from the provinces of Provence, Lorraine, the Three Bishoprics and Brittany no less than one hundred and seventeen are wanting. The edition is moreover cheerfully innocent of scholarship and its defects have been frequently pointed out.³ Since the appearance of this inadequate edition individuals and historical societies have undertaken here and there to print collections of primary cahiers. The most recent and successful enterprise of this character is that of MM. A. de Saint-Léger and Ph. Sagnac, who with the aid of a local society at Dunkirk issued two volumes in 1906 containing the cahiers of Flandre Maritime, with introduction and notes. Chassin has also contributed an elaborate study of the elections and cahiers of Paris.⁴ The way was smoothed for the particular task we have under consideration by A. Brette's admirable *Collection of Documents relating to the Convocation of the Estates General in 1789*.⁵ This is re-enforced by an atlas of the electoral districts.⁶

The commission for the publication of the sources for the economic history of the French Revolution carefully formulated the rules to be observed in the editing of the cahiers, and issued them in a circular addressed to the various local committees, April 5, 1905.⁷ In order to exclude from the collections the numerous private lists of grievances and the protests of dissatisfied minorities and other unauthorized bodies a cahier was defined as one drawn up by a regularly summoned assembly. A committee in each department is to be responsible for the publication, according to the rules laid down by the central committee, of the cahiers of the various bailliages, primary and secondary, of which the chief seat lay within the present boundaries of the department. A few only

³ For example, by Brette, "Les Cahiers de 1789 et les Archives Parlementaires", in *La Révolution Française*, vol. XLVII. (1904), pp. 5ff. He accuses the editors of including "sans ordre et sans methode, dans les six volumes, les cahiers definitifs avec les cahiers des paroisses, les cahiers de corporations avec ceux de bailliages secondaires, sans parler des faux cahiers et des cahiers de particuliers sans mandat".

⁴ *Les Elections et les Cahiers de Paris en 1789* (1888-1889), 4 vols. (in the *Collection de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de Paris*). Partial lists of the private undertakings of this class may be found in the admirable volume by Edme Champion, *La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789* (1897), pp. 7-8, and in the *Cambridge Modern History*, VIII. 802-803.

⁵ *Recueil de Documents relatifs à la Convocation des États Généraux en 1789* (1894-1904), 3 vols., with a fourth volume in preparation.

⁶ *Atlas des Bailliages ou Juridictions Assimilées ayant formé Unité Electorale en 1789* (Paris, 1904 fol.). This like the *Recueil* forms a part of the great series of *Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*.

⁷ *La Révolution Française*, vol. XLVIII. (1905), pp. 353ff. These directions were supplemented by the circular of June 13, 1907, *ibid.*, LV. 73ff.

of the volumes which have thus far been issued under the auspices of the central commission are printed by the National Printing Office at Paris; most are issued from Orleans, Lyons, Nancy, Épernay. While there is a strong family resemblance and they are of the same size—large octavo, with a page somewhat shorter than that of this journal—the various members of the series differ in print, headings, even in the size of the page, differences which are of slight moment but which plainly indicate the decentralizing policy of the commission which has doubtless very wisely apportioned the divisions of their laborious enterprise among the numerous departmental committees. The successive issues are unfortunately not even serially numbered, so that a librarian may well be somewhat uncertain whether he has a complete set to date.

The introductions to the volumes are devoted not only to the technical questions relating to the number and nature of the documents at the editor's disposal but to the economic conditions prevailing in the region under consideration. Indeed M. Bloch furnishes a formal *Esquisse d'un Tableau de l'Etat Économique* of the bailliage of Orleans. In the brief introductions to the individual cahiers or in foot-notes more specific information is given—the number of hearths or of inhabitants in the village or town, the amount of the *taille* and tithe, the cost of labor, etc. Naturally the minutes of the assemblies which drafted the cahiers are given. These are commonly brief and formal and seemingly of minor importance except as establishing the authenticity of the cahier. MM. Bloch and Boissonnade have set the example of supplying very elaborate analytical tables at the end of their collections which enable the student to discover quickly in the maze of texts the references to the particular institution or abuse in which he may be interested. Repetition is avoided as far as possible. Where cahiers were copied from one another or from a common model only the variants are indicated. M. Bloch gives in his introduction to the cahiers of Orleans the various models and pamphlets which appear to have influenced the formulation of the people's grievances. It is a striking fact that a great many of the cahiers have disappeared, seemingly forever; but there is no reason to suppose that the "sensation", as Boissonnade calls it, of the economic life of the time which one may hope to experience upon reading the thousands of *gravamina* and suggestions for reform that are to be included in the present collection, would be essentially modified by the discovery of the thousands that are gone.

Among the matters discussed by the editors is that of the general value and reliability of the parish and town cahiers. A number of serious historians have felt that the data derived from this source was practically worthless. The most confident in his deprecation of the use of the cahiers as serious sources is the German writer Wahl who believes, with M. Héricault, that the Revolution was wholly gratuitous and that the cahiers were but the instrument of unscrupulous agitators

intent upon inciting the peasants to murder and pillage.⁸ This doctrine—by no means new—naturally rouses the republican ardor of those interested in the enterprise we have under consideration. Brette regards the cahiers as a sort of moral inventory of France at the close of the Ancien Régime and holds that by revealing the terrible disorder they constitute the most striking justification of the Revolution.⁹ The fairest and most comprehensive review of the whole matter is perhaps that of Sagnac.¹⁰ Allowing for all exaggerations of style he believes that the more carefully the cahiers are studied and compared with other sources of information the more does one's respect for them grow. Wahl, it may be remarked, based his conclusions on the few local cahiers included in the *Archives Parlementaires*. Boissonnade emerging from long intimate contact with the cahiers themselves says, "Si le bourgeois, le légiste, le lettré, ont tenu la plume, c'est l'artisan, c'est le paysan qui ont presque toujours dicté." As he ran through the cahiers, "au spectacle de leurs incorrections naïves, de leur gaucherie, de leur pittoresque orthographe, il n'est guère possible", he concludes, "de soutenir qu'ils ne sont pas, pour la majeure part, l'oeuvre réelle des assemblées populaires, qu'ils n'expriment pas à la fois les griefs particuliers de la bourgeoisie en même temps que ceux du peuple des villes et des campagnes."¹¹

Modern England: a Record of Opinion and Action from the Time of the French Revolution to the Present Day. In two volumes. By ALFRED WILLIAM BENN. (London: Watts and Company. 1908. Pp. xvi, 250; x, 251-519.)

It was by no means a slight task that Mr. Benn undertook when he began to write the history of opinion and action in England in the 118 years between 1789 and 1907. During the years while he was engaged on his *Modern England*, his work was complicated and made more difficult by the appearance of volume after volume of memoirs and biography, and of such able reviews of recent English history as that of Sir Spencer Walpole in his *History of Twenty-five Years* and that of Messrs. Low and Sanders in the twelfth volume of the *Political History of England*. Could Mr. Benn have recommenced his work after the publication of the biographies of Graham and Durham, Lytton and Lord Randolph Churchill, of the queen's *Letters* and Cromer's *Modern Egypt*, it is conceivable that he would very considerably have modified some

⁸ *Die Notabelnversammlung von 1787* (1899), and *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Französischen Revolution* (1901).

⁹ *La Révolution Française*, XLVII. 6.

¹⁰ "Les Cahiers de 1789 et leur Valeur" in *La Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, vol. VIII. (1906-1907), pp. 329ff. Onou ("La Valeur des Cahiers de 1789", in *La Révolution Française*, vol. XLIX. (1905), pp. 385ff.) agrees with Sagnac that the cahiers are highly subjective and that the peasants' statistics where they cannot be controlled must be taken with caution.

¹¹ *Cahiers de Doléances de la Sénéchaussée d'Angoulême*, pp. 8, 12.

of the judgments he has passed on the actors in the English political field during the middle years of the nineteenth century. As it is, in the light of all these recent publications, much of his work strikes the reader as shallow, and lacking in accuracy and historical thoroughness; while his judgments do not seem to be sufficiently well-founded to command acquiescence or respect.

Mr. Benn writes openly from the rationalistic point of view of the seventies and eighties of the last century, and his bias against the churches must be taken into account. His aim is to give in short compass not a history of events or of political and social developments; but a record of opinion as illustrated in action—to unfold the history of the century from within, as due to human feeling, human reason and human will, rather than as a succession of more or less closely related happenings. It is only by a rigid narrowing of scope that Mr. Benn could have succeeded in compressing the story into 500 pages, and the effort to be brief has brought it about that Mr. Benn states many of his conclusions as *obiter dicta*, unsupported by sufficient information to enable the reader to judge of their accuracy.

To some extent Mr. Benn's book resembles Professor A. V. Dicey's *Law and Public Opinion in England*. Like Professor Dicey Mr. Benn brings out the influence of Bentham, Mill and Malthus in moulding the laws and institutions of Great Britain. He is concerned, however, with much more diverse developments than Professor Dicey. He follows many currents of opinion beside what may be called the main philosophical trend of the age. He tries to give a summary of the religious, political and scientific thought of the nineteenth century, with its effect on education, literature, legislation, and domestic and foreign policy. While it is impossible to expect from any man whose life has been contemporaneous with more than half of the period he reviews an absolutely unbiassed judgment, or a correct understanding of all the forms of thought and opinion that he sets out to describe, it must be conceded that Mr. Benn's work is both useful and valuable. He has woven together in a continuous story the inner life of England during the nineteenth century, and while his book as a history of the period cannot be compared for fullness or accuracy with such works as Sir Spencer Walpole's history or the last two volumes of the *Political History of England* or with special treatises on aspects of the subject such as Professor Dicey's *Law and Opinion in England*, Sir Leslie Stephen's *Utilitarians*, or Mr. G. R. Balleine's *History of the Evangelical Party*, it is an advantage to have gathered up in short space the many and varied lines of thought that underlay the vast expansion and development of the years between the Fall of the Bastille and the incoming of the present Liberal government in England. As is perhaps natural in such a work, the latter part is of least value. The record of the last twenty years, as presented by Mr. Benn, is bald and jejune, and to a younger generation it would seem that Mr. Benn scarcely does justice

to modern ideas and opinions. There is no bibliography, authorities being quoted only somewhat sparingly in foot-notes. While a freer use of the memoirs and letters which have recently appeared would probably have modified some of Mr. Benn's opinions, for example his admiration of Lord Palmerston, it would also have prevented him from continuing some old errors, such as the assertion that Charles Buller wrote the report of the Earl of Durham on Canada.

Modern Egypt. By the Earl of CROMER. In two volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. xviii, 594; xiv, 600.)

Books written by men who have played a great part in the world, recording what they have themselves seen and done, are so valuable a source for the historian that this REVIEW is glad to welcome another. The important ones that belong to this class are few. The *Commentaries* of Julius Caesar and those of the Emperor Baber are the most familiar instances. There are also, however, works in which some eminent person, generally at the close of his career, explains and justifies his policy. This was done by Napoleon Bonaparte indirectly and by Bismarck directly. A third class includes histories of their own time composed by men who have more or less influenced the events they describe. Under this head we may put the treatises of Thucydides, Procopius, Otto of Freysing, Philip of Commynes, John Knox, Clarendon, Burnet. Lord Cromer's *Modern Egypt* stands partly in one, partly in another, of these latter classes. Although to some extent a narrative of what the author did himself, it has also a wider scope, and covers the politics and administration of the Nile valley generally during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. For dealing with this theme, Lord Cromer had several conspicuous advantages. One is that of a thorough and exact knowledge. He took part in most of the important decisions of policy here recorded, and knows the grounds of them. He is himself a source as well as a historian.

It is a second advantage that the subject has a unity and simplicity which corresponds to the country. Egypt is of all the lands in the Eastern Hemisphere that which is most detached from other lands, least affected by what happens on its borders. In this narrative the influences of three foreign powers are of course constantly felt. But though Turkey (or rather the Sultan of Turkey), England and France are constant factors, their action can be described without much reference to the general politics of Europe and still less reference to the internal politics of those three countries. And, thirdly, Egypt is a land whose fortunes are of perpetual interest to all educated men. No country has had so long a history. Its records begin almost twice as far behind us as do the records of Greece or Rome. They set before us fortunes strangely varying from century to century; and it is a

singular fact that a country which nature might seem to have done her best to isolate should have not only been frequently (like Italy) conquered by invaders from without but have been, conversely, a centre of influence radiating forth upon other countries. In art and in religion she told powerfully on other Mediterranean lands.

These characteristics of his theme are, however, small in comparison with the advantages that are personal to the author. He has a vigorous mind which goes to the root of things which fasten on essentials, and which, though it recognizes the complexity of a question, does not fear to reach and pronounce a positive and definite conclusion. We find in him a solid judgment, not prejudiced in favor of any set of political dogmas, nor (so far as appears) of any particular person or party. His criticisms are by the nature of the case passed chiefly on his own countrymen; and they are passed, whether one agrees with them or not, with an evident freedom from partizan bias. The spirit of the book deserves the more praise because when one writes of contemporaries with whom or against whom a man has contended, it is hard to get rid of the impressions formed under the impulse of the moment.

This judicial temper is fitly reflected in a calm and weighty style. There is little rhetoric. Opportunities for literary effect which many a writer would have seized and overdone are either passed by with Thucydidean austerity or used with a restrained strength which leaves the reader to add the color and emotion for himself.

The book falls into seven divisions. The first traces the history of joint French and English intervention, then of English action in Egypt, from the establishment of financial control in 1876 in Ismail Pasha's days down to the English occupation in 1882. The second narrates the troubles in the Soudan which began with the destruction of Hicks's army by the Mahdi in 1883 and ended with the battle of Omdurman and reconquest of the Soudan in 1898 by General Kitchener. The third traces the administrative policy of Britain in Egypt from the occupation in 1882 down till the agreement with France in 1904 which settled many of the questions that had till then hindered the course of reform. The fourth describes the various elements of population in Egypt and the social classes which make up the country. The fifth sketches the several lines of British policy in Egypt. The sixth sets forth the reforms recently introduced; and the seventh contains some reflections on the future of the country.

Of these visions the first three are the more distinctly historical parts, though the others are at least equally valuable, because they contain an account not only of the institutions established by the British government but also of the motives which led to their establishment and the purposes they were meant to serve. To examine these and estimate their value would require so long a preliminary account of the conditions of Egypt that the few observations I propose to make must be confined to the narrative portions of the two volumes.

The most interesting episode is that in which General C. G. Gordon is the central figure. Few passages in recent history have been more frequently and passionately debated. Gordon's striking character, his adventures, his chivalric attitude, the loneliness of his position in the last months of his life had roused in an extraordinary measure the admiration and sympathy of the English people. The failure to relieve him in time was charged as a crime against the ministry of the day. Indeed this failure did much to hasten the fall of the cabinet and to damage the Liberal party at the momentous general election of 1885. Lord Cromer's account, which seems to leave comparatively little to be added by any later historian, would have greatly affected English opinion and mitigated English censure could it have been made public soon after the events and before judgment had been passed on them. He does not acquit the Liberal cabinet of a grave error in sending such a man as Gordon on such an errand. Neither does he fail to censure them for the delay in sending an expedition up the Nile after it had become plain that Gordon either could not or would not retire, and that British opinion demanded his relief. But he brings out the defects of Gordon's own character and his disobedience to the orders he had received with a clearness which if it does not relieve the ministry from blame sets Gordon's conduct in a light very different from that in which the English saw it in 1885. They would have condemned the ministry less if they had understood Gordon better. Gordon was a hero, but a hero who could not run in harness. Heroes seldom can. Lord Cromer's account of him is one of the best things in the book and a real contribution to the comprehension of one of the most romantic events of our times.

Next to his portrait of Gordon the best character studies which Lord Cromer gives us are those of Nubar and of Riaz. Nubar, whom I knew well, was a most remarkable man whose abilities would have brought him to the front in any country. He was Armenian by race and genuinely interested in trying to help his nation. With some of those faults which we call Oriental such as a certain shiftiness (though indeed these "Oriental defects" are to be found in every country), he had many intellectual gifts that are rare in the East; and one could talk to him just as one would have talked to a statesman of continental Europe. Riaz, with less brilliancy, had a firmness and an integrity which deserve Lord Cromer's praise. He is still living in Egypt, much respected and worthy of respect.

English politics and English opinion are but slightly referred to in these volumes. In a treatise describing things as they appeared from the point of view of the actors on the spot, this is natural and fitting. I may however add from my own recollection of those exciting times some remarks which it did not fall within Lord Cromer's province to make but which need to be made in order that the British position may be understood in all its aspects.

The attitude of the Liberal majority in the English House of Commons, which was the power ultimately controlling politics, from 1880-1885, was much affected by three factors scarcely referred to in these volumes. One was the repugnance which English Liberals felt to doing anything in the interest of the European holders of Egyptian bonds. The idea that British intervention was to help these bondholders to make gains was so distasteful to most of these Liberal members as to lead them to hang back and desire to minimize intervention. A second factor was their indignation at the character and tone of the party opposition against which Mr. Gladstone's cabinet had to defend itself. This opposition, though it perhaps did not go beyond the rules of the game as played in domestic matters, seemed to them so injurious where national interests abroad were involved that it made the Liberal majority rally to the ministry even when they distrusted the policy which the ministry was for the moment pursuing. Possibly they might have done better to follow their own opinions, even if the result had been to turn out the ministry. Upon this I express no opinion. But they recoiled from this course through their irritation at the tactics adopted by the opposition. The third factor was the position of the cabinet. Never had England seen an administration containing a larger number of able men. Never was an administration more unlucky. It was unlucky chiefly owing to its internal divisions. It lived by a series of compromises and hand-to-mouth expedients because it was never able to reconcile and bring into one consistent line the divergent views of its members. Perhaps also, occupied as it was by a long series of Parliamentary troubles, it never as a whole gave a thorough study to the Egyptian problem.

Here I must add a word as to the person on whom Lord Cromer seems to throw nearly all the blame for the delays and vacillation of the cabinet. Mr. Gladstone, being Prime Minister, may of course be in a certain sense treated as responsible for the faults of a ministry of which he was the head and whose existence he could have terminated by resignation. But he was only one in a cabinet of nearly twenty members, less directly responsible for foreign affairs than was the Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville, and for military affairs than was the War Secretary, Lord Hartington. It was surmised at the time, and has subsequently become better known, that some of the most important cabinet decisions on Egyptian questions were taken against his judgment. Ought he to have broken up the cabinet because he disagreed with those decisions? The vacillations and delays laid to his charge were largely due to the constant efforts made by the cabinet to hold together through a series of compromises and middle courses. Is Mr. Gladstone to be held solely to blame for what was as much (and in some instances more) the fault of his colleagues as his own, merely because he could have cut the knot by resigning? That question could not be determined without examining the whole political situation as it

stood in 1882-1885, a situation in which the fortunes of the cabinet involved many other grave issues. Lord Cromer's censure of Mr. Gladstone, possibly deserved as respects the delay in sending out the Nile expedition, ought in the four great errors of failing to recall Hicks, of sending out Gordon, of refusing to send Zobeir when Gordon asked for him, and of the Tokar expedition, to fall much less on Mr. Gladstone than on the cabinet as a whole.

I cannot do more than advert in the briefest way to the many morals for the student of political history which the book contains. One touches the difficulties with which the cabinet system of government surrounds the conduct of foreign policy. What these were to the British cabinet of 1880-1885 has already been indicated. In France Gambetta during his brief tenure of power brusquely changed the lines which his predecessor had followed in dealing with Egypt. Having led the British into a course which precipitated a crisis at Cairo, he presently lost office, and made way for a new cabinet which reversed his policy and became the cause of the ultimate supersession of the Dual Control by the sole control of England. An autocrat, or an oligarchy like the Roman senate, might have made mistakes as bad as those made by the French and English governments, but hardly the same mistakes of a frequently shifting or wavering action.

History shows few better instances than we find here of the law by which a strong state that begins to intervene in the affairs of a weak one is forced to go on intervening till it has taken over control. For a long time after 1882 the British government honestly desired to get out of Egypt. Few believed their assurances; but those assurances were made in all good faith. I had myself the best reason to know Mr. Gladstone's wishes in 1886; and still later Lord Salisbury actually conducted negotiations with the Turks for the retirement of the British which nothing but the amazing shortsightedness of the Turkish government prevented from being completed. As years went on, the difficulty of retiring became more obvious, yet hardly until the resolve taken in 1896 to reconquer the Soudan was the conviction forced upon statesmen that England could not quit the Nile valley.

That foreign nations must not expect affection and gratitude from a country which they rule, however beneficent and disinterested their rule may be, is a lesson which the experience of the English in Egypt enforces. They have done many things to improve its condition. The country is far richer, far more populous (if indeed that be an improvement); the people are more secure in life and property and the pursuit of happiness. British administration is more honest and lenient than Egypt has seen since the conquest of Cambyes in the sixth century B. C. But these benefits have not rendered British rule beloved. To the native population it is still foreign rule.

Whatever the future of Egypt may be, the twenty-six years of British control will remain memorable in the annals of the East. So

this account of the methods which Western administrators used in dealing with this ancient country will deserve to be long read, not only because it is a truthful contemporary record of facts but also because it sets forth the motives and the maxims of policy which directed the statesman chiefly responsible for the conduct of affairs. What should we not give for a similar account of his Caledonian campaign by Cn. Julius Agricola, or for such a description of his plans for ruling Mexico as Hernando Cortes might have dictated in the quiet days he spent in that beautiful palace which still stands to commemorate him in the valley of Cuernavaca!

JAMES BRYCE.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Letters of Cortes. In two volumes. Translated and Edited, with a Biographical Introduction and Notes compiled from Original Sources, by FRANCIS AUGUSTUS MACNUTT. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1908. Pp. xi, 354; vii, 374.)

A NEW English translation of the letters of Cortes is by no means superfluous especially when, as in the present instance, it is fairly commendable and adheres as closely to the text as possible, without becoming too literal. We would remark here that the Jesuit priest is never addressed or designated by the title of *Fray*, hence, Father Andres Cavo is not *Fray*. Neither was Luis Ponce de Leon who died with such suspicious swiftness at Mexico sent to Cortes merely to take his *residencia*, but properly as *visitador*. We shall refer to this point later on.

Mr. MacNutt gives us the second, third, fourth and fifth letters, the first which is lost being replaced in his book by the report of the municipality of Veracruz dated July 10, 1519, which as Mr. MacNutt observes, is not improbably a fair substitute for the lost report by the conqueror.

The bibliography given by Mr. MacNutt in the first volume is copious and reasonably complete. In the text of his introduction and of the notes to each letter translated he makes some critical comparisons of the relative value of authorities and several of these short dissertations can be recommended for their justness and impartiality, *e. g.*, references to the late Don Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta and to the Reverend Augustin Fischer, who, however, was not chaplain to Maximilian of Mexico but, towards the end of that unfortunate ruler's career, his private secretary.

Mr. MacNutt's introduction in four chapters (followed by a translation of Cortes's last will and testament) contains a partial summary of the principal events of the life of the conqueror. Several important occurrences are either omitted or barely touched upon and the tone is that of an almost unconditional eulogy of the hero. We are

far from taking the standpoint of most British writers who write with hostility, sometimes even with invective, concerning everything achieved by Spain and the Spaniards; but neither can we agree with the author of this book in his attempt to make of Cortes almost a saint. While we heartily indorse the observations upon the standard of historical criticism to be applied to the deeds in ages past, namely, the standard of the times, their prevalent ideas and degree of culture, his admiration for Hernando Cortes carries him, in our judgment, somewhat too far. There is no doubt that he was a very superior man, a great man mentally, but morally there are flaws upon his character that are, in view of his other brilliant qualities, most unfortunate. These flaws are treated as myths and Mr. MacNutt does not seem to be thoroughly informed on the questions. We allude to the relations of Cortes with the Spanish crown after the conquest of Mexico; the mysterious death of the *visitador* Ponce, and the equally mysterious decease of Cortes's first wife Catalina Xuarez. Beginning with the death of Catalina Xuarez, Mr. MacNutt overlooks the *Pesquisa Secreta* or secret investigation of the matter published in the *Documentos Inéditos de Indias* and which contains abundant testimony most damaging to Cortes. There can hardly be any doubt that he strangled his first wife while in bed. The death of Ponce occurred under such suspicious circumstances that it is difficult to attribute it to natural causes, and it took place before he could begin the *visita*. A *visita* was nearly always an ominous measure and quite distinct from the *residencia* which every functionary of importance had to give at the expiration of his term of office. A *visitador* was frequently clothed with discretionary powers and no viceroy even could escape the results of the *visitador's* action. The home-government in Spain had ample reasons to mistrust Cortes. He had given ample proof of his inclination to do as he pleased and not as he had been bidden. His letter to the emperor dated October 15, 1524, owned and published by Don Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta, is not only a declaration of further disobedience but almost of independence, and could not fail to arouse the gravest apprehensions at the Spanish court. Still, the government was well-nigh helpless, since Cortes was all powerful in Mexico, as his followers had declared to the king. It became necessary to use much adroitness in slowly undermining the position of so dangerous a representative, and never to let him reassume that position again.

Portraits of Charles V. and of Cortes, and reproductions of ancient maps and plans, the coat of arms of Cortes (on cover) and a map of Yucatan from the middle of the past century illustrate the two handsomely printed volumes.

A History of the United States. By EDWARD CHANNING. Volume II. *A Century of Colonial History, 1660-1760.* (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. vii, 614.)

PROFESSOR CHANNING is making substantial progress with his history of the United States, for having completed in this generous volume of more than 600 pages his consideration of the colonial period he is now ready to pass on to the Revolutionary era. The years 1660-1760 belong in greater part to a time much neglected of historians, and present difficulties and problems that have never been met or solved or even understood by many of those who have written hitherto on colonial affairs. For that reason scholars have awaited with expectancy Professor Channing's version particularly of the period from 1689 to 1750. If, after a perusal of the volume, we find it measuring up to a higher standard than that attained by its predecessors, we may deem the praise well earned; if, on the other hand, we find it falling short of the ideal, we may discount our criticism by noting that the day has not come when the history of this troublesome eighteenth century can be written adequately. Patient labor must yet be spent, unexplored material must be brought to light, traditional viewpoints must be changed, patriotic prejudices must be eradicated, and the balance between the purposes that were British and the purposes that were American must be restored. Mr. Beer is teaching us in part how this balance can be obtained, and others following in his footsteps will in time teach us more. That Professor Channing should have grappled with the task single-handed with half his source material beyond his reach, bears witness to his courage; that he should have produced a book destined for some years to stand alone as the only competent history of the period is a certain proof of his ability and understanding.

From the standpoint of the ideal four criticisms may be made. In the first place the work is not free from prejudice. Professor Channing's view of the Restoration shows that he is still possessed of the old dislike of Charles II. and all his courtiers. To speak of Osmund Airy's life of Charles with approval is to set the clock back twenty years; to talk about the "hopeless incapacity" of the Council for Foreign Plantations of 1660 is to betray a sympathy with the prejudices of Massachusetts and unfamiliarity with the actual work of the council; to speak slightly of the colonial governors in general indicates an inherited dislike of the British government and all its works. In the second place, in spite of all its wealth of new information and the manifest labor that has been expended upon it, the work shows occasional omissions that are difficult to understand. Why is practically nothing said of the details of British control from 1660 to 1696? Why is no attempt made to search into the principles underlying the navigation acts or to connect them with England's traditional policy? Why has no attempt been made to deal with the offensive aspects of colonial action and inaction during

the Seven Years' War? Why is all mention of the postal-packet service limited to a brief analysis of the Act of 1710? Some of these omissions constitute serious defects, others that might be mentioned seem strange in view of Professor Channing's allotments of space—as of twelve pages to Fox and the Quakers in England. In the third place Professor Channing betrays a certain insularity in his frequent insistence on the impotence of the home-government and the futility of the system established for the control of the colonies. The efficacy of the royal veto cannot be tested by reference to an occasional act; the value of the plantation duty and other royal revenues cannot be determined except by recourse to sources of information that Professor Channing does not appear to have used; the general efficiency of the Board of Trade cannot be determined from the few scattered references here given to its operations. In fact the chapter on the Reconstructed Colonial System is marred throughout by a manifest lack of sympathy and by a proneness to find fault. In the last place Professor Channing has failed to give his treatment either unity, purpose or depth. He has substituted a topical arrangement for the old geographical distribution of data, and in avoiding Scylla has fallen into Charybdis. We cannot see that his narrative moves forward to any culmination. We should naturally expect to find ourselves at the end of the work ready to understand better the causes of the Revolution, but we cannot see that anywhere Professor Channing has sought to meet this expectation or has made any attempt to search for causes. Progress is noted here and there, but that general movement which marks the development of all the colonies taken together seems to lie altogether outside the author's interest.

Taking Professor Channing's treatment as we find it, we may note its leading features and conspicuous merits. Beginning with a discussion of the colonial policy of the Restoration the author deals with individual colonies, 1660-1689, devoting a special chapter to an admirable description of what he calls the "Gallic Peril, 1664-1689", and completing this phase of the subject with chapters on the Stuart domination in New England and the revolution of 1689-1690. With chapter VIII., on the reconstructed colonial system, he enters the "neglected" period and takes up the act of 1696, the constitutional controversies in the various colonies, the systems of labor, education, religion, and commerce, questions of race-origin and influence, closing with the struggle between England and France. That of the 400 pages given up to these subjects 100 should be devoted to British policy and 150 to labor, religion, education, and commerce is evidence that we have here no following of beaten paths, but a thoroughly new and independent exploring of the colonial field. Professor Channing knows his printed material *au fond*, and is fairly familiar with the manuscript material in Boston and Philadelphia. He does not appear, however, to have searched the *Calendars* very thoroughly or to have made exhaustive use of what he calls the "Phila-

delphia Transcripts". Of other manuscript-material his book shows no certain knowledge. He has analyzed in an admirable manner difficult financial, commercial and industrial situations, has written probably the ablest account of French policy that we have, and has dealt satisfactorily with the character and careers of such men as Dongan, Andros, Shirley and Nicholson. We doubt, however, if he really approves of any of the British representatives in America, and even when trying to be fair he seems to be pleased if the balance can be made to tilt in favor of the colonies. Apart from the first four chapters, where the treatment seems perfunctory and the originality less marked, the material has been handled with firmness and independence and space has been distributed with an admirable disregard for precedents. It requires courage to dismiss the whole history of Oglethorpe and Georgia in less than two and a half pages. The work is elaborately annotated with footnotes and references, while bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter furnish the author with a further opportunity for expressions of opinions. The reproductions of contemporary maps are interesting, though in some instances they are on too small a scale and too faint to be of much value. The general map at the end, prepared especially for this volume and illustrating the territorial expansion of the colonies, is excellent. Professor Channing has set so high a standard of accuracy in his work that it is surprising to find a few errors of rather an unexpected character. He speaks of Methodists in 1671 (p. 16), of Professor Williston Walker as still at the Hartford Theological Seminary (p. 437), and twice of a "State Paper Office" in London (pp. 62, 477). He seems to take Berkeley's well-known statement about learning and printing in Virginia as if it were literally true, and he certainly implies that there were no executions for witchcraft in the colonies before 1688 (pp. 83, 458-459). His belief that the Bishop of London's jurisdiction originated in the bishop's membership in the Virginia Council under James I. seems to us wholly improbable, since the bishop's jurisdiction did not arise until after the Restoration.

We may not agree with all that Professor Channing has said or be entirely satisfied with his way of treating the history of this period, but we do acknowledge that he has produced a book of first importance for the study of the neglected period and in so doing has removed a reproach hitherto cast upon historical scholarship in America.

The Writings of Samuel Adams. Collected and edited by HARRY ALONZO CUSHING. Volume IV., 1778-1802. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1908. Pp. xvii, 431.)

WITH this volume the series of Adams's writings is complete. We now know what is to be known of the arch-conspirator and revolutionist. One can be reasonably sure that there is nothing of importance omitted from these volumes, because the editor has been industrious in hunting

material, and also because they contain so much that is of slight consequence. Surely no intelligent editor would give us some of the things we find here, if the space were needed for anything else. It must be confessed that the series is rather disappointing; we have gained so little additional knowledge about a man who for some twenty years was a great influence in American history. Justice to the editor and to the volumes compels one to say, however, that this disappointment arose from our expecting too much, from an eager anticipation of the sight of materials that apparently do not exist. We are thankful especially for the materials in the first two volumes without which it is difficult or impossible to understand the preliminaries of the Revolution.

The present volume covers the period from January, 1778, to the end, the first letter being to Richard Henry Lee, the last an eminently sane and wholesome epistle to Tom Paine. Thus it will be seen that we have here the correspondence of twenty-four years besides no small number of public papers. The letters during the war are to a surprising extent commonplace or devoid of real helpfulness. If Adams had one passion left him after his devoted attention to liberty and his wooing of that frigid spinster, civic virtue, whose beauties and worth he ceased not to proclaim, he wasted it on the Lees, especially on Arthur. His confidence in this restless son of Virginia, whom he appeared implicitly to have trusted long before he had ever looked into his face, is in truth one of the striking facts of the volume, meaning a good deal to the student of Revolutionary politics. On the whole, as one reads, one is impressed more and more with the feeling that he has come upon the letters of a very substantial second-rate man. How difficult it would be to find letters covering a period of twenty years written by Washington, Jefferson, Franklin or Madison so free from anything like real inspiration or genius!

There are a few telling letters in the period of the Confederation, one or two of which tell the old story that in the days before Shays's Rebellion, if there were poverty and misfortune, imprisonment for debt, and commercial depression, there were also extravagance and prodigal expenditure. "Our merchants", Adams writes, in July, 1785, "are complaining bitterly that Great Britain is ruining their Trade, and there is great Reason to complain, but I think much greater, to complain of too many of the Citizens thro' the Common wealth who are imitating the Britons in every idle Amusement and expensive Foppery which it is in their power to invent for the Destruction of a young Country. Can our people expect to indulge themselves in the unbounded Use of every unmeaning and fantastick Extravagance because they would follow the Lead of Europeans, and not spend all their Money? You would be surprizd to see the Equipage, the Furniture and expensive Living of too many, the Pride and Vanity of Dress which pervades thro every Class, confounding every Distinction between the Poor and the Rich and evincing the want both of Example and Oeconomy." This is

interesting testimony not only concerning the industrial conditions during or immediately preceding the days of gloom, but also concerning the influence of the Revolution in erasing distinctions. The most significant letter in this period is the well-known one to Richard Henry Lee, in which Adams says after reading the Constitution, "I confess as I enter the Building I stumble at the Threshold." Several letters, written in the last decade of the century, interestingly disclose at once his old devotion to the Union and his essential Republican principles, which enable him to write to Jefferson in April in 1801 that he congratulated the country "on the arrival of the day of Glory which has called *you* to the first office in the administration of our Federal Government".

One the whole the collection will be useful. I am not sure that all the really good matter could not have been put in two-thirds of the space, but historical students are not apt to find fault with completeness.

John C. Calhoun. By GAILLARD HUNT. [American Crisis Biographies.] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Company. 1908. Pp. 335.)

JUDGED by the requirements of the series in which it appears Mr. Hunt's *Calhoun* must be pronounced highly successful. It shows a mellow scholarship on constitutional questions, a general knowledge of social and political conditions in the South, and a clear style controlled by a mild and even temper. Not especially profound nor original, except in minor matters, it avoids ponderous and commonplace historical judgments, and has a peculiarly instructive and interesting freshness.

Although it can hardly be called a complete biography, it is the first serious effort to describe the plain man Calhoun as well as his doctrines. In previous biographies and often in essays Calhoun has usually taken on some of the attributes of a god or of a monster, according to the writer's prejudice, mental condition or lack of information. The publication of Calhoun's correspondence nearly ten years ago made it possible to change all that. In fact and in Mr. Hunt's narrative Calhoun the nationalist and Calhoun the sectionalist are very natural products of very different political conditions. The Calhoun prior to 1820 and the Calhoun subsequent to 1830 were of course wholly inconsistent. But such inconsistencies are the rule wherever the circumstances so change as to make a corresponding change of attitude on the part of a public man a prerequisite of his continued supremacy. It is these facts that are important; and Mr. Hunt has made them very clear without elaborate argument or much concern about the reader's judgment.

Since Houston's *Critical Study of Nullification*—one of the most effective monographs in American history—there have been no mysteries about the South Carolina of that time. But Mr. Hunt has retold the story in a refreshing manner and has made contributions and correc-

tions of importance. It had been so often stated by historians that Calhoun's *Exposition of 1828* was approved by the legislature that such careful scholars as Houston and Herman V. Ames accepted it as true. Mr. Hunt corrects the error (p. 108). Moreover, the manner in which he develops his chapters and proceeds with his narrative shows that he has unusual literary taste and skill, which are so often lacking in American scholars. His concise and sprightly chapter on South Carolina in 1830, not to mention others almost as good, demonstrates the value of these qualities. South Carolina's effervescence, Calhoun's leadership and dogmas are so lucidly and briefly described that dry-as-dusts will be likely to mistake an easy mastery for a graceful superficiality.

Mr. Hunt's best qualities are displayed prior to the end of the Nullification movement. That movement brought out the main features of the Calhoun of South Carolina history; but that Calhoun is to the Calhoun of United States history hardly more than the General Grant up to 1863 is to the Grant of the whole war. Without studying Calhoun in national affairs during the last fifteen years of his life we lose one of the most important examples in history as to how economic interests and subtle dogmas may lead even a high-minded people to destruction. Mr. Hunt has not failed to touch on the leading features of the period 1835 to 1850, but he has rarely done more than that. Here there is also a marked decline in the excellence of his style and in the substance and the skilful development of his chapters. The indications are so strong and numerous as to compel the inference that the author's studies of this period have not been extensive enough to enable him to trace and describe the full meaning of Calhoun in relation to the Confederacy and Reconstruction.

It would be unfair to emphasize this minor deficiency in a biography with many excellencies. What was most needed, Mr. Hunt has supplied—a description of Calhoun so clear and a judgment of him so sane that there is no room for disagreement as to the main features. And excepting a few such slips as the writing or printing of *Williston* instead of *Willington* (Waddell's famous school), and of Foote of *Alabama* instead of *Mississippi*, no positive errors have been noticed.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

Stephen A. Douglas: a Study in American Politics. By ALLEN JOHNSON, Professor of History in Bowdoin College. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. x, 503.)

UNTIL recently the number of books about Stephen A. Douglas has been confined to the campaign lives of Sheahan, Flint and Warden, published in 1860, the *Treatise* issued by J. Madison Cutts in 1866, and two slight sketches of recent date. In the voluminous periodical literature of the last half-century, crowded with articles about Lincoln, there is practically nothing at all about Douglas. This neglect has been

due chiefly to widespread distrust of his sincerity, to the fact that, by taking middle ground in the great sectional controversy, he satisfied neither extreme, and to the destruction of his papers, which would have been the chief reliance of the biographer. There are now signs of a reviving interest in Douglas's career and a prospect that he will be given a place in American history commensurate with his influence.

Professor Johnson has had the use of some new material—an autobiographical sketch, lent by Judge Robert M. Douglas, which it is to be hoped may be published in full. He has rescued a few Douglas letters and has diligently utilized all references to Douglas in reminiscent books but his main reliance has necessarily been the *Congressional Globe*. As indicated by its subtitle, Professor Johnson's book is mainly confined to an analysis of Douglas's public life. He has evidently felt that the data for a personal life do not exist and has therefore preferred to limit himself to a task which he could accomplish completely and satisfactorily. Within these limits, there is little fault to be found. Points to be particularly noted are the presentation of the fact that Douglas consistently supported the principle of local self-government from the beginning of his political life, the analysis of the dual constituency in Illinois which necessitated compromise upon Douglas's part and involved him in the logical contradiction that ultimately proved his undoing, and finally the disproof of the commonly accepted belief that Douglas was guilty of truckling to the South. Professor Johnson shows, necessarily in less detail than Professor Ray has done, how the Nebraska Bill was the resultant of factional quarrels in Missouri and controversies over Pacific railroads, Indian titles and territorial government. Its regrettable aspect was Douglas's "attempt to nullify the Missouri Compromise by subtle indirection". The Lincoln-Douglas debates are carefully analyzed but without remark upon their merit. In the opinion of the reviewer, they have been overpraised by Lincoln's biographers and were scarcely worthy of the debaters and of the issues involved. Douglas's last years were little less than heroic and his biographer's enthusiasm increases as he reaches them. There is a discriminating chapter descriptive of his personality, which brings out the finest trait in Douglas's character—his magnanimity. The book ends abruptly with Douglas's death and we miss a final charge to the jury. As a whole the judgments expressed are sound and will command ultimate acceptance. If there is any criticism, it is that the fact is not sufficiently emphasized that non-intervention offered the only possible escape from civil war, that this was Douglas's reason for adopting it and is his best defense.

Some details call for comment. The literary style is good but lacks a certain definiteness which is needed to vivify the issues, the times and the man. In evident anxiety not to overload the pages with dates, Professor Johnson has gone to the other extreme so that it is difficult to fix chronologically many of the events and speeches discussed. The

addition of dates to the *Globe* references in the notes would have rendered material assistance in this respect. Professor Johnson is in error in saying that "the submission of state constitutions to a popular vote had not then (1856) become a general practice", as may be readily ascertained by reference to the table in Judge Jameson's *Constitutional Convention*. The treatment of the Black controversy is somewhat inadequate and inaccurate. This pamphlet war attracted considerable attention at the time. Reprints of the *Harper* article were scattered broadcast throughout the country. Black replied in three pamphlets, Douglas in two, and the controversy was closed by an elaborate defense of Douglas attributed to Reverdy Johnson. Flint does not "give extracts from these pamphlets" but only from the least important—the last by Douglas.

F. H. HODDER.

A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860.

By ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of American History, University of Wisconsin. (New York: The Columbia University Press. 1908. Pp. xvii, 405.)

THIS is the latest contribution to an important phase of Southern history, which, until recent years, has received comparatively little attention from investigators.

Professor Phillips's point of view is indicated by the following extract from his preface: "Captains of industry and captains of transportation rank in substantial importance near the political leaders of similar merit and service; and the promotive campaigns for 'internal improvements' bear as much significance in the general development of the nation as do many of the campaigns of president-making."

In his introduction, the author divides the ante-bellum South into the following seven "great economic provinces, more or less distinguished by their staples and their natural facilities for transportation": (1) the tobacco region of lowland and Piedmont Virginia; (2) the rice and Sea Island cotton region of the Charleston-Savannah coast district; (3) the eastern cotton belt, extending from the southern edge of Virginia to central Alabama; (4) the western cotton belt, embracing the region from Alabama to Texas and extending as far north as the southern edge of Kentucky; (5) the region of Kentucky and middle Tennessee with its products of tobacco, live stock and grain; (6) the Tennessee-Shenandoah region with the same commodities as the Kentucky and middle Tennessee region but having different transportation problems; (7) the comparatively barren peninsula of Florida.

The volume traces the historical development of transportation in South Carolina and Georgia from colonial days to the War of Secession. Special emphasis is laid upon the last 35 years of the period, six chapters out of the nine in the book being devoted to them.

The author gives a satisfactory treatment of the numerous plans

for solving the important problems of transportation that confronted the different commercial centres and the moves and counter-moves which they made in order to procure trade advantages over their rivals. The plans of commercial campaigns with their objects and difficulties, as well as triumphs and defeats, are given an adequate treatment. The continuous and, at times, desperate efforts of Charleston to maintain her commercial supremacy by a system of internal improvements, independent of federal aid, and the conflicts which this aggressive policy engendered with Savannah and other aspiring cities make a story of absorbing interest.

Perhaps the most interesting chapters in the book are those devoted to the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad, which, at the time of its completion, "was the longest railway in the world" and to the Western and Atlantic Railroad, which is "the most important example in American history, thus far, of the State ownership and operation of railroads". The history of the latter enterprise is doubly interesting since it "made Georgia the keystone State of the South, and Atlanta the gate city from the northwest to the eastern cotton belt".

The work has been done in a scientific way. The sources consist mainly of rare manuscripts, newspapers, pamphlets and books, many of which are inaccessible to students who cannot investigate the subject on the ground.

Unfortunately Professor Phillips devotes practically all of his book to the history of transportation in South Carolina and Georgia instead of giving a history of transportation in the entire eastern cotton belt as promised by his title. He dismisses the subject of transportation in the cotton belt of eastern Alabama with a statement that is "a story in itself which does not here need the telling", reference being made to Martin's *Internal Improvements in Alabama* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, series 20, no. 4). He also dismisses the subject of transportation in the cotton belt of North Carolina with a slight amplification of the statement that it is analogous "to the Savannah, both in natural conditions and the policy of the commonwealth regarding it" and with a reference to Weaver's *Internal Improvements in North Carolina previous to 1860* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, series 21, nos. 3-4). In the light of these facts it would seem that his title is rather pretentious.

The maps showing the Principal Products and Trade Centres for the Georgia Counties, 1835, and the Transportation Routes in the Antebellum South are helpful.

The United States as a World Power. By ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. vii, 385.)

"THIS book was originally prepared in the form of lectures, which were delivered at the Sorbonne in the winter of 1906-07 as the Harvard

lectures on the Hyde foundation." Although entirely recast since then, it "still retains traces of having been first addressed to a foreign audience" (see author's preface). But this must be accounted a distinct gain rather than a loss, inasmuch as the author has "striven to preserve a neutral, rather than a specifically American attitude." Yet the patriotic American reader need not be alarmed at this pronouncement, for both in respect to style and attitude this volume bears indubitable evidences of American authorship.

In the introduction (p. 7) the term "world powers" is defined as "powers which are directly interested in all parts of the world, and whose voices must be listened to everywhere". This definition, although "not scientifically exact", is sufficiently accurate and comprehensive for the purpose of the author, *viz.*—"a study of the part which the United States plays in the great drama of world politics". Such a definition of "world powers" would seem to exclude the United States before 1898. It also excludes present-day Austria, Italy, China and even Japan. The five powers admitted by Professor Coolidge to the inner circle of present-day World Powers are, in the order of their importance from the double points of view of area and population, the British Empire, Russia, France, the United States and Germany.

If grouped into sections or general divisions, the nineteen chapters of this volume would naturally fall into two parts. The first nine chapters attempt to explain how the United States came to be a World Power. They are devoted to topics or problems involved in a study of our national growth and territorial expansion, such as Nationality and Immigration, Race Questions, the Spanish War, the Philippine Question, etc. The author's views on immigration and the race question are more optimistic than are those of students like Professor Commons who have perhaps gone more deeply into the subject. On the negro question, our author's sympathies are plainly with the white men of the South; on the Oriental problem, with the labor unions and white inhabitants of the Pacific Coast. The exposition of the Monroe Doctrine is sound from the American standpoint, and should serve to convince German and other European critics that, whether mistaken or not, the people of the United States are thoroughly in earnest in regard to this matter.

The second half of the volume (chapters x. to xix., inclusive) deal successively with the relations between the United States and France, Germany, Russia, England, Canada, Latin America, China and Japan. The author finds our relations with France "friendly"; with Germany and Russia "excellent" in spite of recent causes of irritation; and that the relations between England and the United States have undergone a complete transformation since the Spanish-American and Boer wars. The only possible bone of contention imperilling our friendship with England is Canada, which is geographically and ethnically a part of the United States. Perhaps the most interesting chapters are those

devoted to our relations with China and Japan. With China, "the prospect for American relations, though clouded, is not disheartening" (p. 340). With Japan, "for the moment, at least, the danger of serious complications seems past" (p. 355). As a solution of the immigration problem, Professor Coolidge favors the imposition of a property qualification. To this might be added the physical test proposed, *e. g.*, by Professor Commons.

Of course there are particular statements scattered throughout the book, which the reviewer would like to challenge, did space permit. Such, *e. g.*, is the assertion (p. 24) that "the New England element has, on the whole, been the dominant one in the formation of the American character." This claim—to name but one element—ignores the importance of the Scotch-Irish in the development of the Middle-Western American type, of whom Abraham Lincoln is the most illustrious example. The statement (p. 64) that "the man of European blood . . . would reject with indignation the suggestion that a man of another race might marry a member of his family", is certainly too broad. Many readers will dissent from the characterization of Mr. McKinley (p. 80).

On the other hand there are many passages in this book which the reviewer would like to italicize, as, *e. g.*, the denunciation (pp. 368–369) of grandiloquent expressions like "dominion of the seas" and "mastery of the Pacific".

But the author asks in his preface that his book "may be judged as a whole, rather than praised or blamed on the strength of detached passages". Judged in this way, we should say that it is sane, honest, and at once scholarly and popular in the best sense. The style is clear and even racy, abounding in colloquialisms.

It is gratifying to learn from the publisher's announcement that this thoroughly American book was published simultaneously in French and German translations. According to a writer in the *North American Review* for September, 1908 (p. 467), the German press is greatly "impressed with its judicial aspect". Its reception in France, England and the United States can scarcely be less favorable.

Indeed, this attractive volume deserves a conspicuous place in our libraries by the side of such works as Latané's *America as a World Power*, Moore's *American Diplomacy*, Hart's *Foundations of American Foreign Policy*, Foster's *Century of American Diplomacy* and Reinsch's *World Politics*.

AMOS S. HERSHEY.

MINOR NOTICES

State and Family in Early Rome. By Charles W. L. Launspach, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. (London, George Bell and Sons, 1908, pp. xx, 288.) The introduction states that the central idea of this book is "that the early Roman State was a conscious imitation of the ancient Gens or ancient Family, that its theory of Government was founded upon the relations existing between kinsmen, and that these, again, were determined by religious notions which later became transformed through developments within the City and external influences". The titles of the chapters—the Religious Basis of Roman Society, the Gentes, the Reformed Constitution of Servius Tullius, the Revolt of the Aristocracy, Marriage, Patria, Potestas, etc.—indicate with sufficient clearness the scope of the book.

The author, a barrister-at-law, is evidently a good example of the cultivated Englishman whose interest in classical antiquity is keen and discriminating, and who has read rather widely. He has taken the traditional view of his subject and has produced a readable and generally interesting book for those with tastes similar to his own. As he appears, however, to be quite ignorant of the present state of discussion and criticism in the investigation of his subject, it must be said in all candor that his work has no value for the student, and therefore no criticism from the scientific point of view is in place. For the general reader it would have been much better if many of the technical legal terms and transferred Latin words had been omitted.

S. B. P.

Under the title *Helladian Vistas* (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1908, pp. vii, 407) Dr. Daniel Quinn has brought together about twenty-five papers which have appeared in various periodicals. These essays are already familiar to students of Greek life, and were they not, Dr. Quinn's known enthusiasm for things Hellenic (or should we say in this instance "Helladic"?) would be a sufficient introduction to the book. The outsider must not suppose, however, that this is merely a bundle of dry classical studies; on the contrary the classical is in the minority. In effect it is rather a book of travel, a sort of personally-conducted tour. We are taken to the Acropolis of Athens, to an Athenian cemetery, to the regions about Mycenae (perhaps we should have said *Akropolis* and *Mykenae*, for Dr. Quinn clings somewhat closely to Greek forms, writing even "Zeus" and "Elevsinian"), and to the vale of Tempe. We are also shown the Olympic Games, and, so far as may be, the Mystic Rites of Eleusis are unfolded to us. But it is to those places to which our classical studies less often lead us that our author oftenest conducts us—to "The Land of the Klephts", to "Mega Spelaeon or the Monas-

tery of the Great Cave", to "The Phaeaks' Island", to Zakynthos ("The Flower of the East"), and to other localities, among which Arkadia and Mesolonghion are not to be forgotten. History, ancient, medieval and modern, mingles with the description of natural scenery and characterizations of the people. The "tone" is a delightful one and even those who are not classical students will find the book full of interest.

Herculaneum, Past, Present and Future. By Charles Waldstein, Litt.D., Ph.D., L.H.D., Slade Professor of Fine Art in the University and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Leonard Shoobridge, M.A. (London, Macmillan and Company, 1908, pp. xxii, 324.) This is a sumptuous product of the book-maker's art, printed in large type, with wide margins, and illustrated with fifty-nine beautiful plates. In an elaborate introduction the history of Waldstein's propaganda for the international excavation of Herculaneum is set forth with the utmost fullness of detail. Part I. contains chapters on the Topography of Herculaneum, the Inhabitants of the District, the Earthquake of 63 A. D. and the Eruption of 79 A. D., and the History of the Site since the Eruption. Part II. consists of a chapter on Reform in Excavation, and a description of the author's plan for the organization and carrying out of the work. This he assumes would require the services of a resident force of upwards of fifty archaeologists, engineers, chemists and geologists, and would cost one hundred thousand dollars annually for an indefinite period. Five appendices contain the correspondence and documents relating to the scheme of excavation *in extenso*; the passages from the ancient writers that deal with Herculaneum, with translations; a list of the principal objects that have been found, certainly or probably, during previous excavations on this site; a guide to the Villa Suburbana; and finally a bibliography of Herculaneum.

The useful portion of the book comprises the appendices with the exception of the first, the plates, and part I., but unfortunately this last section which should have been made the best and most valuable of all is marred by so many signs of haste and of being a purely perfunctory performance, that it is unsatisfactory. It is the rest of the book, the introduction, the correspondence in appendix I., and the plan of excavation that furnishes the principal reason for its publication. This belongs of course to Waldstein alone, and it is in effect an *apologia*, interesting and amusing enough, but hardly for reasons that would appeal to the author himself. His plan for excavating Herculaneum under the direction of an international staff and with the support of funds collected in all parts of the world has been widely reported and commented on by the press of two continents during the past three years. It was an attractive programme but doomed to failure from the beginning. Crowned heads and ambassadors are useful in their way but not as archaeologists, and social prestige is not a sufficient guarantee of scientific authority. Moreover, under existing conditions, it is

utterly idle to expect to raise any such sum of money as that contemplated by this scheme.

Waldstein's sincerity and zeal cannot be questioned, and in some ways he made out an excellent case, but the obstacles in his path could not be overcome. It was certain that when the critical moment arrived, the Italian authorities with whom the final decision rested would never enter into any such arrangement. Their real attitude is most amusingly shown in the way that the Minister of Public Instruction dodged Waldstein on his last visit to Italy (p. 47).

The description of the organization of the staff and the methods of conducting the excavations supposes the work to be in progress. All the details of daily work and recreation are fully set forth, and the reader is introduced into an archaeological Utopia, but the effect of this is, unfortunately, to diminish any serious impression that other portions of the book may have made.

S. B. P.

Corso di Storia del Diritto Pubblico Germanico. Opera Postuma dal Professore Tullio de Sartori-Montecroce. Pubblicata dal Professore Andrea Galante. (Trento, Tip. G. B. Monauni; Venezia, Tip. Emiliana, 1908, pp. xvi, 443.) Professor Sartori-Montecroce, who died in 1905, held at the university of Innsbruck the "Italian chair of the history of law and German law", a chair founded in response to the demand among the Italian-speaking inhabitants of southern Austria for courses in the university in their own language. In the course of his teaching the history of German law he planned to write a book on this subject, since there existed no general work in Italian, but his premature death prevented this. He left, however, the notes and apparatus which had served as the basis of his lectures, and which he had planned to use in the projected work. The task of editing these notes was undertaken by Professor Galante who transcribed the manuscript notes and amplified them from such annotations as Professor Sartori had made, and from the lecture notes of his students.

The result is a manual of the history of German public law following pretty closely the general lines of the familiar works of Brunner and Schröder. After a general introduction of 19 pages (devoted to a discussion of general topics: content of the subject, sources, literature, auxiliary sciences, and arrangement of material), the work is divided into four periods, following the usual division: I. the Germanic Period; II. the Frankish Period; III. the Middle Age; IV. the Modern Age (to the dissolution of the empire in 1806). Two appendices treat (1) the constitutions of the Confederation of the Rhine, of the German Confederation of 1815, and of the North German Confederation, and (2) the status of jurisprudence in Germany and especially the legislation since the dissolution of the empire.

Within each period the material is treated under two heads, general

history and special history. The former section ("Storia Generale") is devoted to the description of political, social and economic conditions, and to a study of the sources of the laws; the second ("Storia Giuridica Speciale") to particular forms of law, as for instance in the Middle Age, feudalism, the king, the papacy and the empire, the court and the central government, the provincial officials, the diet, etc.

The work should prove of great value to Italian students in general because of the absence of any similar work in Italian. There is no reason to suppose, however, that it will in any way replace for other students the manual of Schröder or other German works of this sort.

E. H. MCNEAL.

De Geschiedenis van de Leidsche Lakenindustrie. I. De Middeleeuwen (Veertiende tot Zestiende Eeuw). Door Dr. N. W. Posthumus. ('s-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff, 1908, pp. xii, 452.) Before beginning the history proper of the cloth industry at Leiden as it may be read after an exhaustive examination of the records, Dr. Posthumus refutes to his own satisfaction certain accepted statements as to the antiquity of woollen manufactures in the eastern Netherlands. Such assertion as the one that Friesland cloth had a high reputation in the time of Charles the Great he dismisses as unfounded, while he points out that the garments wrought at the abbey of Werden (c. 1000 A. D.), mentioned as *pallia* were undoubtedly linen, the one *pallium laneum* being referred to as an exception, not the rule. During the thirteenth century cloth manufacture was confined to a very few localities, though the fabric was an important article of retail trade in various quarters of the Low Countries. Its production was a domestic manufacture, a home affair and little developed. Division of labor was not customary, the labor was hand-work and on a small scale and the independent *entrepreneur* (*ondernemer*) was unknown. In the fourteenth century conditions changed. Drapers as well as weavers and other craftsmen began to play an important part in the municipal affairs of Holland and Zeeland. New burghers were attracted into the cities and the industry caused the growth of the towns, and there was a distinct tendency on the part of the city corporations to foster industrial in preference to landed interest.

Information in regard to Leiden itself is very scanty before 1350. The names of the *Fullersgracht* (1316) and the Weavers Lane (1341), prove that cloth-making existed but there is no definite proof that the industry was sufficient to demand recognition in the civic organization at those dates. The oldest statute anent cloth existing in the Leiden archives is a regulation for government inspection before sale (1363). From that year on there is repeated legislation on the subject. Though the draper's craft was probably never as highly developed in Leiden as in Flanders there are two or three peculiarly interesting features that characterized its establishment and growth. From its inception, ap-

parently, division of labor was practiced to a marked degree as is shown by the lists of fleece-washers, combers, spinsters, weavers, fullers, etc., and, further, the master-workmen were not exploiting the industry for their own benefit but were dependent upon capitalistic *entrepreneurs*.

By the end of the fifteenth century Leiden turned out a good supply of cloth and the first twenty years of the sixteenth century saw no diminution in this prosperous activity. Then a decline began, owing to a variety of causes but chiefly to the imperial-French warfare and the first years of the Eighty Years' War prevented a revival. The story is interesting and well told and deserves consideration at the hands of an expert able to make critical comparisons of these conclusions with others for other Netherland cities. Dr. Posthumus intends to carry on his study of the Leiden manufacture to the end of the eighteenth century but he leaves the account of the revival after the siege (1574) for a second volume.

RUTH PUTNAM.

De Armezorg te Leiden tot het Einde van de 16^e Eeuw. Door Dr. Christina Ligtenberg. ('s-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff, 1908, pp. 354.) This volume presents a careful and scholarly history of the care of the poor in the town of Leiden up to the end of the sixteenth century. It is based on a minute examination of the earliest existing records of the various charitable foundations and of the city archives, and contains a study of the relations between private and public measures. As a whole, it is far too valuable to be disposed of in a brief notice. The work should be translated and issued as a publication of some society devoted to the problem it touches.

The topics considered may be indicated by the table of contents—General Introduction, St. Catherine's Hospital, the Women's Hospital, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, the Lepers' House, the Holy Ghost and the Holy Ghost Hospital, Out-paupers, Free Dwellings, the Responsibility of the Authorities for the Care of Paupers. To these are added appendices with documents.

Passing over the history of each of these private foundations, it is interesting to note that the first point made by Dr. Ligtenberg in her résumé is that the manager of every shelter (*gasthuis*) and hospital (*ziekhuis*), the director of the so-called societies of the Holy Ghost—organizations found in nearly every Netherland city—and the overseers of the out-paupers (*huiszitten meesters*) were all alike appointed by the city government, and obliged to render account thereto, no matter what the origin of their funds. This feature differentiates Leiden from other cities where the private institutions were free to manage their affairs at their own sweet will.

A second conclusion is that the individual generosity lavished upon the unknown paupers was not based on a desire to lessen their numbers and remove the evils that made them prey upon society; the benefac-

tions were given for the sake of the givers, to secure for them peace and happiness in the hereafter. Not until the sixteenth century was the problem treated from the point of view of the community. The last benefaction of the old type in Leiden was the Bethany Almshouse, founded in October, 1563. After that date new notions in theology made strides, the attitude changed as to what personal benefit could be secured by the giver. A modern theory of duty to the poor had been outlined by one Vives, a friend of Erasmus. In 1577 in a council meeting of February 20, a certain young burgomaster of Leiden presented a report which showed, as our author put it, that "historic insight that so markedly differentiates the renaissance from the medieval man". He declared that Leiden was suffering from indiscriminate charity, that the numerous convents and foundations had attracted beggars with their alms, and that the rich peasants in the neighborhood had added to this evil by giving largely to rid themselves from the importunity of the army of tramps. He further declared that the capitalistic exploitation of manufacturers had gone hand in hand with pauperism. That was the beginning of new regulations, and their history is left for another volume, which can hardly be as interesting as this, though it will undoubtedly be a contribution to the literature of municipal philanthropy.

RUTH PUTNAM.

The English Factories in India, 1622-1623; a Calendar of Documents in the India Office and British Museum. By William Foster. (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1908, pp. xl, 389.) This volume of 376 documents maintains the interest already stimulated by its predecessor (cf. AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XII. 879). The excellent introduction provided by the editor and the useful index are good guides to the topics here treated. These include English connections with Portuguese, Dutch, Persian and Indian affairs. First stands material for the history of the siege and capture of Ormus, the decisive event in Anglo-Portuguese rivalry. This achievement in 1622 by Anglo-Persian forces also suggests to the student a precedent for a diplomatic policy which has long regarded an Asiatic ally against a European rival as essential to English interests. In some respects the Anglo-Japanese alliance of our own day, therefore, finds an early historical analogy.

Though the Anglo-Dutch blockade of Goa in 1623 is also here recorded, the progress of Anglo-Dutch rivalry is equally to be noticed. Thus English factors complain that "we carry the name but the Dutch have the gaines" (p. 127) and the "Dutch ys insolent, and feare not to breake all contracts" (p. 128). Finally in 1623 is the mention of "'the lamentable death of soe many our good freinds in Amboyna, performed on them by the Dutches crultie'" (p. 260). Thus disputes in Connecticut, rivalry as to the fisheries of the Narrow Seas and the memory of the spice trade of Malaya, are all ultimately to promote popular justification for the renaming of New Netherland as New York.

The relations of the English with native authorities in India form another topic of importance. These are now no longer confined to Surat. At sea the English attempted reprisals on native craft for exactions hardly endured on land (*cf. passim* and pp. 283, 341). The result is a new grant of terms for trade at Surat made on November 15, 1623 (p. 322), a fact, which as Mr. Foster points out in his preface, has been "hitherto unnoticed by historians". Furthermore through Pulicat and Masulipatam, on the east coast, the English have already indicated the field of their second sphere of influence in India, which later is to centre at Madras. Here also is there reaction of native politics and wars on the company's commercial ventures.

The vexed problems of religion and race contact are further suggested in various ways. Thus (p. 313) the Persian alliance is criticized because Englishmen ought not to "'dispossess Christianitie (although our enemies) to place in faithles Moores, which cannott but bee much displeasinge to Allmightye God'". Also the English factors at Pulicat wrote that as the result of Dutch orders 38 mixed marriages have taken place in one day. "'All those thatt soe marry heere to blackes are bound and tyde to everlastinge service in India and cannot returne to there cuntrye. Such is there [Dutch] pollicie in that kinde, which hath taken effect; and to speake truly most parte of this base nacion desyer nott to see moore there owne cuntrye; yea, there carryadge and manners of lyving is more heathen licke then the people of the country themselves, whoe take much notice thereof; to which brutishnes we leave them'" (p. 147).

Did space permit, much more on other matters would be noted, for with the exception of 31 documents more briefly calendared by Mr. Sainsbury (*C. S. P., East Indies, 1622-24*), this material is for the first time in print.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

A Scots Earl in Covenanting Times: Being the Life and Times of Archibald 9th Earl of Argyll (1629-1685). By John Willcock, B.D. (Edinburgh, Andrew Elliot, 1907, pp. xxi, 453.) Covenanting controversy dies hard. More than a hundred and twenty years after the execution of the ninth Earl of Argyll we have from the able pen of Mr. Willcock a biography of that nobleman as full of the zeal which inspired the Covenanters as if it had been written to accompany the Revolution of 1688. In spite of his strong prejudices, perhaps in some degree on account of them, Mr. Willcock has written a good book which is at once useful and readable. The feeling still shown in discussion of the great Covenanting movement gives us some measure of the fervent depth of that movement itself. And the Covenanters have this advantage. They are having the last word. There is not much said nowadays on the other side.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—25.

The present work is, as the author states, rather a history of Scotland during the Restoration than a biography of Argyll, though that history is in so far as possible centred about his career, and in the great tragedy of his failure history and biography coincide. None the less, at other times, the titular figure is often shadowy enough, for the ninth earl was in no sense, save at the end, the factor in affairs that his father was in the generation of the Civil Wars. In some ways it seems almost a pity that Mr. Willcock did not frankly take the history rather than the biography for his work. Moreover the book lacks something on the side of the broader setting and deeper background which a fuller account of English affairs in this period would have supplied. In its pages London and the Privy Council seem too far away, much further in fact than they were, from the point of view of English administration, even in the time of Argyll. One may observe, as an instance of this that the omission of the word "Cabal" from the index, itself an indication of omission in the text, shows that English affairs on which those of Scotland so largely depended find here too slight consideration. Thus the dismissal of Turner and Ballantyne (p. 158) hinged on a general policy far more comprehensive even than the pacification of Scotland, and one in no small measure outside the field of Scotch affairs which affected it far less than they were affected by it.

This must be the main criticism of the book. For the rest it is vivid and generally accurate, informed with the spirit of its time, alive with the passions of one of the most unhappy periods of Scotch history. Based as it is on contemporary evidence, its heroes and villains are exalted or convicted out of their own mouths or the less trustworthy accounts of their contemporaries. In many instances, notably the Argyll rebellion, its minuteness of detail is extraordinary. Nowhere is that story told in such detail. And nowhere, one may fairly add, is the whole period so vividly pictured as here. Something may be lacking of sobriety and moderation, something remains to be said on the other side, but it is none the less a book to be reckoned with by him who would understand Scotland, or even England in that time. Despite its evident bias, its display of recondite erudition, fortunately confined to foot-notes, its occasional quaint phraseology, it is an eminently interesting and important piece of work.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Le Mouvement Ouvrier au Début de la Monarchie de Juillet (1830-1834). Par Octave Festy. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne. Tome II., fascicule III.] (Paris, Edouard Cornély et Cie., 1908, pp. 359.) In the history of the labor movement in France, the period from the Revolution of July, 1830, to the adoption of the law concerning associations and insurrections in April, 1834, is of great importance, since within these years this movement first assumed, at least to any marked

degree, a social and even a political character. Economic conditions and the political situation prepared the laboring class to accept some of the social theories of the school of St. Simon, of Buchez, and of Fourier, whether presented to them immediately or through the mediation of certain Republicans; but the new feeling of class-solidarity, of class-importance and of the dignity of labor was chiefly due, not to the acceptance of social theories, but to a consciousness that it was the proletariat who had brought to a successful issue the Revolution of July. The increased sense of their own importance resulted in the formation by the working men of numerous labor associations and in various other efforts to better their own lot. When the monarchy of July turned a deaf ear to their demands it drove them into social and even into revolutionary action.

The above are some of the main conclusions reached by M. Festy in his excellent monograph, in which he describes in great detail the history of the numerous labor coalitions in various trades in different parts of France during his chosen period and carefully traces the modifications of the ideas of the proletariat class, and the development of a programme of social reform. The book is based partly on material from the national and local archives, and on official reports, but to a much greater extent on newspapers and other periodicals.

The Life of Sir Halliday Macartney, K. C. M. G. By Demetrius C. Boulger, with a foreword by Sir James Crichton-Browne, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (London and New York, John Lane, 1908, pp. xxiii, 515.) Macartney's work in China began with that of Parkes and Wade and Hart and Gordon, all of whom appear to have entertained a sincere regard for him, yet with the same opportunity at the outset he cannot be said to have achieved a reputation equal to any one of theirs. While he kept his honor bright in spite of the continual assaults of temptation, long dealings with unscrupulous officials had the effect of dimming the ideals of his earlier years. Thus while he became what the world recognizes as a sane and safe man of affairs he lost the power of higher flight which is engendered by the spirit.

The abiding interest of this book lies in its admirable and detailed accounts of many important episodes in the contact of China and Europe through half a century. Macartney reached China as an assistant surgeon of a British regiment during the second part of the Arrow War in 1860, and shortly after the conclusion of peace left the service of his country to learn Chinese and make fame or fortune by guiding their affairs. His ambition, as he declared later, was to become an adviser to the throne, after the manner of the Jesuit Verbiest in the seventeenth century, with a vague idea, perhaps, that he might have the luck of a Phaulkon if things went his way. He must have been very ignorant then of the actual conditions in the capital; he learned them later. At the end of his life there was probably no one

in the West more familiar with the detail of Chinese politics. After a period of campaigning with the Ever-Victorious Force, during which Gordon picked him as his successor, Macartney became the superintendent of an arsenal under the immediate patronage of Li Hung Chang. His success in organizing and conducting a pretty effective manufactory of amunition and cannon at Nanking against adverse conditions was remarkable, but the removal of his patron to Tientsin rendered it impossible at last to make head against the jealousy of the officials, and in 1875 he resigned his position to be appointed foreign adviser and secretary to the first Chinese embassy to England. The remainder of his career was passed in the Chinese legation in London until his retirement in 1905 a few months before his death.

The author has assembled letters and documents concerning the negotiation of treaties with Russia (1881) and France (1885), as well as others covering the opium and Burma questions with England, which will render it a volume of permanent value to the student of Chinese history. A few errors and inconsistencies in the spelling of Chinese names are hardly of importance enough to mar an exceptionally good biography.

F. W. WILLIAMS.

The Two Hague Conferences and their Contributions to International Law. By William I. Hull, Ph.D., Professor of History in Swarthmore College, and Member of l'Association des Journalistes de la Haye de la Deuxième Conference de la Paix. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1908, pp. xiv, 516.) It appears from the preface that "this book was written in the hope that it might be of service" in carrying out the recommendation of the National Educational Association that "the work of the Hague Conferences and of the peace associations be studied carefully, and the results given proper consideration in the work of instruction". Owing mainly to its length, uninteresting style, and amount of detail, it does not seem to be adapted for use as a text-book in colleges and universities, to say nothing of secondary schools.

Judged from another point of view, Professor Hull's book may be pronounced fairly successful. It is a good summary of the discussions and work of the two Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907; and will doubtless prove highly useful to students and teachers of international law as well as to peace advocates.

The arrangement of topics is such that large portions of the book can readily be omitted. For example, the reader solely interested in Arbitration may read the 222 pages devoted to that subject, and omit the 86 pages dealing with Warfare on the Sea, and the 98 pages devoted to Warfare on Land. He may also readily compare both Conferences on particular points; for the work of each is kept carefully distinct, not merely in respect to general subjects but even as to sub-topics. But the

reader who contents himself with the Summary of Results (pp. 449-503) will not obtain a very correct or adequate idea of the real value or significance of the Conferences.

The book is replete with facts which are fairly well organized, and, as a rule, correctly stated, but Professor Hull rigidly abstains from any criticism or interpretation of these facts. Some of the details furnished are alike uninteresting and unimportant. The style is extremely colorless and formal, and lacks warmth and animation or personality.

In his Summary of Results, the author is thoroughly uncritical and greatly overvalues some of the results achieved by the Hague Conference of 1907. He apparently fails to realize that most of the articles specifying neutral rights and duties, both on sea and land, are mere codifications of existing practice, and that the Conference took some steps backward rather than forward. This was notably the case in its regulations on submarine mines, which are characterized (p. 481) as "a very long step". A "long step" indeed, but in the wrong direction.

The work is fairly well proportioned. But the author devotes twenty pages (pp. 390-410) to the technical subject of Arbitral Procedure, and only seventeen pages (pp. 410-427) to the highly important project for a Court of Arbitral Justice, and twenty pages (pp. 370-390) to the Hague Tribunal or so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration. On the other hand, he fortunately devotes seventy-four pages (pp. 297-370) to the interesting subject of Obligatory Arbitration.

The work is almost exclusively based upon the official documents, of which it is indeed a mere summary. It has a good index, but contains no references to the literature of the subject with the exception of Holls's *Peace Conference* with which this volume will hardly bear comparison.

AMOS S. HERSHEY.

Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation, 1601-1646. Edited by William T. Davis, formerly President of the Pilgrim Society. [Original Narratives of Early American History. Volume VI.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908, pp. xv, 437.) This edition presents in a convenient and serviceable way one of the most important and interesting of the original narratives of early American history.

The important details of Bradford's life and the interesting story of the loss, discovery and return to Massachusetts of the original manuscript, are well stated in the introduction. The fact that Bradford was the principal author of "*Mourt's Relation*", so called, is the reason assigned by Mr. Davis to justify the presentation of his argument in support of the theory, probably correct, that the initials "R. G." affixed to the letter to John Pierce which is printed in the *Relation* are the initials of Richard Gardner, a passenger of the *Mayflower*, and not, as has been generally believed by the leading authorities and writers of Pilgrim history, a misprint for R. C., the initials of Robert Cushman.

The notes are helpful but might well have been more extended and more numerous. The editor has used with great freedom the notes of Dr. Deane to the first edition of the *History* published by the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1856, and it would have been well to have recognized his indebtedness to Dr. Deane more fully and explicitly.

The note on the Compact, p. 106, suggests what is undoubtedly true, that "an undue significance has been given to this Compact". In addition to the logical reasons there given for the suggestion, it might have been well to note also that the words "body politick" in the Compact, upon which so much stress has been laid by many writers, were used by John Robinson in his letter to the Pilgrims at the time of their departure—"You are to become a body politick using amongst yourselves civil government." Not merely the idea and plan for a government by the majority can be found in the charter, patent and letter, but also many of the important phrases used in the Compact itself.

The omission noted on page 367 of the clerical opinions of the ministers, Reynor, Partridge and Chauncey, and the two pages following, seems to the writer not justifiable. Their letters were thought by Bradford important enough to minutely record. These omitted pages of the manuscript are significant of existing conditions in the colony, and the fact that the opinion of the ministers was taken on the question of what acts were to be punished with death is a material one to the student of early New England history, and their reasoning and conclusions have a curious interest. It would seem that the American Historical Association might properly publish in its collection of *Original Narratives of Early American History* the full text of the manuscript, when the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts had printed it as a matter of course and without any criticism. If the plan adopted here of expurgating the original narratives to suit the delicacy of later days is generally followed, the value of these reprints will be materially diminished for students of early American history.¹

This edition of the Bradford manuscript fills a present need in view of the fact that the first edition with the excellent notes by Dr. Deane had been long out of print, and the State edition was published without any notes; it will be found of great convenience and value.

Defence of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. By James H. Moore. (Raleigh, Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1908, pp. xvi, 157.) The writer of this note has little patience with the whole dispute over the authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration, except as an historical puzzle and as a useful exercise for a critical student. The whole controversy proceeds upon the assumption that a declaration like

¹ The point is worthy of discussion. The editor of the series is opposed to expurgation of its texts in any but the most extreme cases. But he believes that, in books intended partly for use in school and college classes, it is justifiable to excise detailed discussions of unnatural sins.—ED.

the supposed one of May 20 was a noble act, instead of being, as it then was, the rash act of some fanatical radicals who used no reason about the actual state of affairs at that time. Before such a resolution of independence could be greeted as an act of wisdom, all the course of events between May 20, 1775, and July 2, 1776, must have passed before the eyes of the men of the time. Moreover, the supporters of the Mecklenburg claims assume that the act of the Mecklenburgers was of the same class as that of the Continental Congress in 1776; whereas, in fact it has some of the ludicrous character of the act of that famous Abolitionist who seceded from the state of Massachusetts because its attitude toward slavery did not please him. It was not a courageous act because it was a silly, premature, inconsequential act. If the resolution of May 20 could be fully established the fact would not signify that North Carolina was the first colony to take up the idea of independence, for but one county and the radicals in it are concerned. Other colonies contained individuals who had that idea even earlier.

Mr. Moore's book is largely devoted to refuting the arguments of the much more scholarly book by William H. Hoyt, wherein the Declaration of May 20 is held to be a myth. Though Mr. Moore has little or no training in the methods of historical criticism now in vogue, yet he reasons well at times, and in some places—notably pp. 66–69—attacks Mr. Hoyt's conclusions very effectively. Both men have left the field of unbiassed historical investigation and become special pleaders. Mr. Moore is scholastic, depending on tradition and the good character of those who carried it down to a later generation. He brings a host of Aristotles to his aid. Indeed, a large part of the book deals in biographical glorification meant to prepare the reader to believe anything that emanates from so saintly personages. His cloud of witnesses is of sufficient size to disturb one who would speak positively against his contention. In fact Hoyt and Moore succeed chiefly in showing us how easy it is to interpret in two different ways the little real testimony we have. Mr. Moore's book is valuable because it contains undoubtedly the best that has been said on his side of the question.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Calendar of the Papers of Benjamin Franklin in the Library of the American Philosophical Society. Edited by I. Minis Hays. Volumes I.–V. [Record of the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin. Volumes II.–VI.] (Philadelphia, printed for the American Philosophical Society, 1908, pp. xx, 573; 526; 560; 510; 325.) The record proper of the Franklin bicentennial celebration held at Philadelphia in April, 1906, under the auspices of the American Philosophical Society was issued shortly after that event, as volume I. The calendar of the Franklin Papers, now published in five volumes, one of which is the index, completes the *Record*. Of the known Franklin material the American Philosophical Society possesses

78 per cent. or 13,800 pieces, the Library of Congress 2938 pieces, and the University of Pennsylvania 840 pieces. The history of these papers is given succinctly in the editor's preface. The Library of Congress issued in 1905 a calendar of those papers in its possession, and inasmuch as the present calendar includes, in an appendix, the papers possessed by the University of Pennsylvania, the entire mass of Franklin papers is now made available for historical research.

The letters are not calendared in one chronological order but are separated into four classes: letters to Franklin (occupying the first two volumes and the larger portion of the third, or 1533 pages); letters from Franklin (125 pages); letters to William Temple Franklin (167 pages); and miscellaneous letters (those not belonging in either of the other three classes, 229 pages). A similar classification is followed for the collection of the University of Pennsylvania. Naturally the larger portion of these letters and documents belong to the period of the Revolution, though the material for the ten or eleven years preceding 1774 is not small except by comparison, while there are also a good many papers belonging to the early eighteenth century and some to the seventeenth. For instance, of the 1533 pages devoted to the letters to Franklin (reference is here to the American Philosophical Society's collection only) 24 pages include all of an earlier date than 1763, 133 pages compass the years 1763 to 1773, both inclusive, the period from 1774 to 1790 occupying the remainder. Among the documents antedating the beginning of Franklin's own activities are several originals of historic value. The earliest of the letters to Franklin is of the year 1730 and the earliest from him is of the year 1733. (Just why the page of contents should make the initial date 1757 does not appear.)

A striking fact is the great number of persons who at one time or another wrote to Franklin. The names of many Frenchmen and some French women appear among his correspondents, some with considerable frequency. For instance, from Madame Brillon there are 119 letters. Physicians and scientists hold a particularly prominent place. From Lafayette there are 78. Of letters connected with Franklin's diplomatic mission, there are 222 from Dumas, secret agent in Holland; from John Bondfield (Bordeaux) 94; from John Paul Jones 85; from Arthur Lee 58; from John Adams 53; from William Lee 30. The greatest number of letters from any one individual is 352, from Jonathan Williams (counting only his letters) to Benjamin Franklin. It is noticeable that Americans in public life are hardly at all represented, except for a few men connected with the business of foreign affairs during the war. One series of letters, however, deserves mention, the letters, 99 in number, of James Parker, comptroller of the post-office. These are principally of the years 1764-1770.

The letters from Franklin are for the most part drafts and the more important of them have been printed. Throughout the calendar when a printed text is known to exist the location is noted. The index is

copious, containing numerous subject-references as well as names. In the case of the more important persons a brief statement of identification is appended. The calendar and index are both well done.

The Works of James Buchanan, comprising his Speeches, State Papers and Private Correspondence. Collected and edited by John Bassett Moore. Volume IV., 1838-1841. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1908, pp. viii, 512.) The years covered by this fourth volume of Buchanan's writings, including as they do the larger part of Van Buren's administration and the transition from Democratic to Whig control, constitute a period of especial interest and importance in American politics. Buchanan, still a leading member of the Senate, had an influential hand in most of the business of note which came before that body, and while apparently not courting controversy did not hesitate to declare his opinions. As a whole, therefore, the papers in this volume are of more general significance than those which have preceded them. On the subject of the Northeastern Boundary Buchanan spoke several times, and at length, strongly upholding the claims of the United States at the same time that he was urging moderation and peace. The conservatism which caused him always to respect the established order of things led him, in January, 1839, to oppose a repeal of the salt duty, on the ground that the compromise of 1833 ought to be observed. A few days later he framed a long constitutional argument against a bill to prevent and punish political activity on the part of Federal office-holders. He continued to be mentioned for the vice-presidency, an office for which he had no desire; and in December, 1839, declined the office of attorney-general, though subsequently irritated at the action of Van Buren in giving the place to Gilpin rather than to a Pennsylvanian. He had already expressed the fear that Van Buren, whose hope of renomination was well known, had lost New York, but he later, in the Senate, defended the administration against the charge of extravagance. In August, 1840, he vigorously attacked the Whigs in a speech before the Pennsylvania State Democratic Convention.

He championed the independent treasury project, speaking twice at considerable length, the second time in response to criticisms of him uttered in the House of Representatives; but he could not approve the plan of a "Fiscal Bank". Toward the Abolitionists and their methods his hostility continued strong. In August, 1838, at a Democratic mass-meeting at Lancaster, he denounced Abolition as directly responsible for slave insurrections and the fear of them, as a violation of constitutional compact, and as tending straight toward disunion; and later he rang the changes in much the same fashion, and in February, 1840, defended the recent practice of the Senate in refusing to receive Abolition petitions.

As regards Buchanan's unofficial life, the volume affords little light.

Of the ninety-two pieces here collected, only nineteen are letters, and all of these relate to politics. Evidently politics was becoming the whole of his career, as in our own day it became the career of John Sherman.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

The Justice of the Mexican War: a Review of the Causes and Results of the War, with a view of distinguishing Evidence from Opinion and Inference. By Charles H. Owen. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908, pp. viii, 291.) The subtitle of this book is strikingly like that of Jay's *Review*, which, though published at the end of the Mexican War as an antislavery document, has been extensively used as a basis for the treatment of the war, its causes and results. The idea that a pro-slavery conspiracy for the annexation of Texas and the despoilment of Mexico was in existence as early as the Austin settlement in Texas has had wide currency. The present book is an attempt to disprove it by "distinguishing evidence and opinion". The result is not altogether successful for the reason, first, that no new evidence is produced to maintain the general thesis, and, second, that the author seems unable to rid himself of the idea that the Mexican War was an immediate and necessary result of annexation. Included as causes of the war are the topics of Texan history: colonization, revolution, independence and its recognition by the United States, claims against Mexico, and annexation. The author's principal dependence seems to have been Niles's *History of South America and Mexico* (1838) and Yoakum's *Texas* (1856). These he opposes to those American historians, grouped somewhat amusingly, who have denied that "Uncle Sam is always a gentleman." Thus while opinion was to have been distinguished from evidence, personal opinion steps in and the book ends with a warning to "such authors as the labors of professorships hamper in the labor of independent historical investigation—not to be blinded by the glamour of great names and the opinions of great and noble men, and not to follow the multitude into the error of construing facts into conformity with somebody's preconceived theory". This praiseworthy warning might carry greater weight had it not been preceded by so many pages bearing serious inaccuracies of statement. That the majority of the American people favored annexation (p. 30); that they enthusiastically sustained the Mexican War (p. 30); that the British at Ghent attempted to seize Louisiana (p. 240); that Slidell was sent home August 1, 1846 (p. 264); that Taylor was ordered to the Rio Grande the same day (p. 266); that in 1846 war was unhesitatingly offered to Great Britain and France as well as to Mexico (p. 253), are some of the more or less novel suggestions, taken almost at random.

J. S. R.

Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, volume III.; Lincoln Series, volume I. *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858*. Edited with introduction and notes by Edwin Erle Sparks, Ph.D., President of the Pennsylvania State College. (Springfield, Illinois, State Historical Library, 1908, pp. xi, 627.) Students of American politics will be grateful for this newest edition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. For many reasons it is likely to be the definitive edition. The circumstances under which the original edition appeared in 1860 were such as to cause, then and subsequently, many doubts as to the accuracy of the text; and not even the asseverations of Lincoln and the publishers, that he had made only verbal changes in editing his speeches, satisfied his opponents. President Sparks has performed the tedious task of comparing the reprinted speeches of both Lincoln and Douglas with the speeches as reported for, and printed in, their respective newspaper organs—the *Chicago Press and Tribune* and the *Chicago Times*. The result attests anew Lincoln's veracity and lays for all time the ghost of the old charge.

But the title of the book hardly suggests the wealth of other material which it contains. With rare discrimination the editor has selected from the contemporary press such references to, and comments upon, the campaign as give local color to the debates, weaving all together with deft editorial touches. That these excerpts are often bitterly partizan and vindictive does not, of course, detract from their historical value as a sort of atmospheric background. It is possible, however, that the editor would have done well to put the unwary reader on his guard by indicating the political persuasion of the newspaper from which each excerpt was made. Yet in most cases the bias is so obvious that comment is unnecessary. Additional newspaper material is grouped in chapters bearing such titles as Election Day and its Results, Humor of the Campaign, Campaign Poetry, etc. The volume contains also an account by the editor of the various editions of the debates, a bibliography of the debates, and an index.

ALLEN JOHNSON.

The Story of the New England Whalers. By John R. Spears. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908, pp. 418.) The first six chapters of this book relate to the early history of the whaling industry, especially at Nantucket. Then follow five chapters giving adventures of whalers and a description of the methods of capturing whales. The remaining chapters treat of Whaling as a Business Enterprise, the Mutineers and Slavers, Tales of Whalers in the Civil War, and In the Later Days. The personal element so predominates that the title ought to have been "Stories of the New England Whalers". The reader will find it interesting reading and will obtain a vivid impression of whaling life, but other and more important phases of the story are either lacking or inadequately treated. The work is based largely on sec-

ondary material, such as earlier accounts of the whale fishery and local histories. It accordingly adds very little to our knowledge of the subject. The classic treatise by Alexander Starbuck, *History of the American Whale Fishery from its Earliest Inception to the Year 1876*, still gives the best account of the early history of this subject.

Slight attention is paid to the influence of the whalers on the economic and social development of New England. For a treatment of this important topic and an interpretation of the story, not a mere chronicle nor a series of adventures and stories, one must turn to a recent monograph of high value, *A History of the American Whale Fishery*, by Walter S. Tower (Philadelphia, 1907). This is a scholarly and comprehensive account of the subject, with statistics and tables, showing capital invested, number of people engaged, number and tonnage of vessels at different whaling ports 1794-1906, annual imports and exports of whale products and the average annual price of oil and bone. Mr. Spears quotes many books but omits to mention this the most important for the period 1815 to 1860, well named "The Golden Era of Whaling".

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN.

The Niagara River. By Archer Butler Hulbert, Professor of American History, Marietta College. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908, pp. xiii, 319.) The author has treated of the Niagara in its geologic, scenic, historic, dynamic and picturesque aspects, and has succeeded in his apparent purpose of producing a "popular" volume, which many illustrations and good printing make attractive. Compiled from many sources, it lacks the literary distinction which the theme should inspire. The historical chapters derive value from the use of early and rare maps; but although many of the best authorities are cited and liberally quoted or paraphrased, no use appears to have been made of the principal collection of historical data on this subject—the *Publications* of the Buffalo Historical Society—by the aid of which these chapters might have been made far more complete, especially on the French period of control. Only in slight degree is Mr. Hulbert's work a contribution to history. The unquestioning spirit in which newspaper accounts of Niagara "cranks" and sundry phenomena have been accepted has filled some of the chapters with errors or dubious statements, *e. g.*, the alleged passage over the falls of "Steve" Brodie. Even less excusable are errors dealing with important events of which authentic records are readily available. The Devil's Hole massacre did not occur as the victims were on their way "from Lewiston to the upper fort" (p. 214), but as they were returning from Schlosser's towards Fort Niagara. The "castle" at Fort Niagara was not begun in 1725 (p. 200), but in 1726. *De Nonville* should be *de Denonville*. The battle of Lundy's Lane, stated on page 46 to have occurred July 5, 1814, was fought July 25, as correctly given on page 281. The many errors of this sort, and the

inadequacy of the historical chapters, detract from its value even for the use and entertainment of the unexacting "general reader".

The Making of Colorado: a Historical Sketch. By Eugene Parsons. (Chicago, A. Flanagan Company, 1908, pp. 324.) The making of Colorado is an interesting story which is by no means told in Mr. Parsons's little book bearing that title. It is a part of the Westward Movement, dealing with the significance of geography and the trails, the lure of gold, and the struggle, within the artificial bounds of a young state, of highly varied social and economic interests. The making was begun in the fifties; it is not yet done; and Mr. Parsons, in spite of his title, has scarcely heard of it.

There are two large works on Colorado history which, together, have made possible this little elementary digest. Frank Hall's four volume history, though journalistic and inaccurate, is still valuable as the work of an active pioneer. Jerome C. Smiley's *Denver* is exhaustive, well-illustrated and more scholarly than most local histories. These works have been used frankly and constantly here. Some other titles are mentioned by Mr. Parsons in his bibliography, but they have not served to improve the balance or coherence of his story. It is not alone the hand of man whose work is here described. The first section of the book deals with geography and geology, with "predatory reptilian monsters" and the "bird-footed Dinosaur". In later chapters are reviewed, disjointedly, the explorations of Pike and Long, of Fremont and Gunnison. The early territorial period receives ample treatment of its kind in chapters on Denver, the rush for gold, and the Indian troubles, upon the last of which Mr. Parsons has formed a judicial, scholarly opinion. But the real building of the state is dismissed with casual mention of its railways, mines and agriculture. The sources which Mr. Parsons followed gave him little light upon later Colorado, and he has made no independent study for himself. He concludes his book with chapters on constitution, public institutions, and education, with obvious desire to suit his work to the needs of elementary schools desiring history readers. History, biography, geology and archaeology all serve his purpose, not to mention his poetic introductory:

"Through vistas of the far-off years
I see the trains of pioneers.
Their schooners headed for Pike's Peak;
The shining grains of gold they seek."

Smiley and Hall are quite sufficient upon the general history of Colorado until someone shall exceed their learning and improve upon their skill.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Canadian Types of the Old Régime, 1608-1698. By Charles W. Colby, Professor of History in M'Gill University. (New York, Henry Holt

and Company, 1908, pp. ix, 366.) In this very attractive little volume Professor Colby has printed a series of lectures which he delivered to a popular audience in the Canadian capital a year or two ago. Each lecture has become a chapter, and each is intended to discuss, in a general way and without undue multiplication of details, some salient and outstanding feature of French colonization during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The men who came from France to found a Bourbon empire in the New World were the representatives of a versatile race; their tastes and capabilities led into fields which were far apart; their exploits covered the continent from the mouth of the Mississippi to the shores of Hudson Bay; and from among their leaders one might have little difficulty in choosing a score of the most picturesque types in American history. Dr. Colby has taken upon himself the pleasant task of ranging broadly through the history of New France, selecting with due discrimination from the list of eligibles eight striking figures around whose careers he weaves his story of how French dominion rose and fell. Thus the narrative of early discoveries and explorations ranges itself around the intrepid personality of Samuel Champlain; the life and martyrdom of Jean Brébeuf forms the main theme in a discussion of French missionary zeal and aspirations; while the unobtrusive career of Louis Hébert, first seigneur of the St. Lawrence valley, furnishes the guiding thread in a survey of what colonial agriculture was able to achieve during its swaddling days. Passing on to the heyday of French power and aggressiveness, the soldier Lemoyne d' Iberville and the trader Du Lhut afford the types wherewith one may measure the capabilities of colonial France in the arts of war and peace; while around the commanding figures of Laval, Talon and Frontenac the author ranges his lucid exposition of the merits and faults of that system under which New France essayed to administer her affairs of church and state.

Professor Colby asserts with emphatic frankness that his book contains no new material and that it uses only the work of others. Some readers may be lured into taking him at his word; but there are others who will know better. For in its general conception and method, in the facility and success with which the author is able to interpret the history of New France by reference to what was going on beyond the seas, and in his suggestive analysis of the motives which guided men and dictated movements the volume gives us much that is new, and gives it, moreover, in a form and style so attractive that it will undoubtedly prove both interesting and profitable to a wide circle of readers. In the field of Canadian history it is the most readable book that has appeared for many a day.

WILLIAM BENNETT MUNRO.

TEXT-BOOKS

The Making of the English Constitution, 449-1485. By Albert Beebe White, Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908, pp. xxvii, 410.) This work by a professor in a Western state university is an excellent indication of the interest of American students in the history of the great institutional mother-land. The period of English constitutional history that Professor White deals with is the formative age from the coming of the English tribes to Britain to the accession of the first Tudor ruler. The first sixty pages of the text constitute part I., on the Anglo-Saxon Period, 449-1066. Here we have a brief and, on the whole, rather too general account of the institutional history of this important and fundamental period. Although the sources of information for Anglo-Saxon institutions are few they are sufficient in scope and reliability to justify a more definite and illuminating account of pre-Conquest government than Professor White seems able to give. It is evident, however, that the author takes a strongly favorable attitude towards Continental influence in English institutional development, and in part II. of the work there is an interesting and well-worked-out account of the Norman Conquest and its more immediate results as indicated in the mingling of Anglo-Saxon and Norman institutions.

The main portion of the work is contained in part III. where the making of the judiciary, the executive, and Parliament are dealt with. The first of these topics is treated at somewhat inordinate length as compared with the space given to the other two. Professor White's treatment of the executive is the least satisfactory of the three divisions, and he lays himself open to serious criticism in regard to the origin, development and character of the council by insisting on its continuity from the Norman *Curia Regis* and in failing to be definite and explicit as to its later character and development. The account of the making of Parliament is far more satisfactory but is less thorough and comprehensive than the chapter on the judiciary.

As Professor White has designed his work for text-book uses he does not make any really positive contribution to our knowledge of English institutions but seeks to give an interpretation of English constitutional and legal history based on the best secondary authorities. He shows himself a very faithful disciple of the late Professor Maitland and of Professor G. B. Adams and copious extracts from the well-known and easily obtainable works of these two writers take up space in both text and foot-notes. In view of the marked lack of critical and bibliographical foot-notes in connection with many controverted questions it would seemingly have been better to have omitted some of these long quotations and given the space to critical

and bibliographical notes. A select and annotated bibliography and lists of topical readings are prefaced to the work and will be of use to both teachers and students. Among the mistakes and printers' errors noted by the reviewer the following seem most important: *Litchfield* (p. 65) for Lichfield, *Stewarts* (p. 157) for Stuarts, *Cheney* (pp. 184, 186) for Cheyney. In general appearance and make-up the book is attractive, and is provided with a serviceable index.

N. M. TRENHOLME.

Documentary Source Book of American History, 1606-1898. Edited with notes by William MacDonald, Professor of History in Brown University. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908, pp. xii, 616.) This volume, as indicated by the preface, has been prepared in order to meet the requests of teachers for documents suitable "for courses of instruction of an elementary or comprehensive character, or which cover both the colonial and the constitutional periods of American history in a single year". By condensation and the omission of certain provisions, the selections constitute about two-thirds of those to be found in *Select Charters*, *Select Documents* and *Select Statutes*. While it is probable that no two persons would agree upon what should be included in a single-volume "Documentary Source Book", it must be acknowledged that this one does contain, in general, the fundamental charters and statutes. The Constitution of the United States, however, is easily accessible and the space assigned it might well have been devoted to three documents included in *Select Charters* not so available for class use; namely, Albany Plan of Union; Virginia Resolutions of March 12, 1773; and Petition to the King, July 8, 1775.

The suggestive introductory notes of the earlier volumes have been retained with slight changes. Professor MacDonald has performed a real service for the teachers of history by bringing together in a single convenient volume this kind of supplementary material.

J. A. J.

NOTES AND NEWS

GENERAL

Achille Luchaire, professor of medieval history at the Sorbonne, died on November 13, at the age of sixty-two. Taking his doctor's degree at the École Normale in 1877 with a thesis on Alain le Grand, sieur d'Albret, he became in 1879 professor in the university of Bordeaux, devoting himself at first to medieval philology. In 1880 the academy offered a prize for a work on the growth of the royal power under the first six Capetians. Luchaire won it, and in 1883 brought out the first edition of his *Institutions Monarchiques de la France sous les premiers Capétiens*, followed in 1885 and 1890 by his catalogues of the acts of Louis VII. and Louis VI. In 1888 he became *professeur-suppléant*, in 1890 professor, at the Sorbonne. In 1892 he published his *Manuel des Institutions Féodales*, eight years later the portions of Lavissee's *Histoire de France* relating to the period 987-1226. Turning then to the history of the papacy, he spent in Rome many months of the years 1902-1907, and published in six small volumes a remarkable history of Innocent III. He was a foremost leader in that process of basing medieval history on solid documents rather than on chronicles and memoirs, which has in the last thirty years been so notably carried out in France.

Mr. Worthington C. Ford has resigned his position as Chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress to accept the office of editor of publications of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Few readers of this journal, and certainly none who have visited the Division of Manuscripts, need to be told what invaluable service Mr. Ford has rendered to the library during the past six years, how extensive have been the acquisitions due to his activity, persuasiveness and knowledge of the field, nor how completely that knowledge and the resources of the Division have been placed at the service of historical scholars. A greater approach has been made toward creating in Washington an historical archive for scholars than in all the years preceding. Mr. Ford's successor in charge of this priceless collection is Mr. Gaillard Hunt, hitherto a chief of division in the Department of State, and known by several excellent historical publications.

Mr. Clarence S. Brigham of the Rhode Island Historical Society goes to Worcester to become, from January 1, librarian of the American Antiquarian Society. Mr. Howard M. Rice succeeds him as librarian of the society first named.

Mr. William O. Scroggs, hitherto of the editorial department of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, has been elected assistant professor of history and economics in the Louisiana State University. Professor Scroggs has nearly completed for the Carnegie Institution a financial history of Alabama and has well in progress a life of William Walker, the filibuster.

Professor Jesse Macy of Iowa College and James A. Woodburn of Indiana University are to teach at Stanford University during the second semester of the present academic year.

Professor Ernst Daenell of the University of Kiel is lecturing through the autumn and winter quarters at the University of Chicago.

Guglielmo Ferrero, the author of *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, is now in the United States and will lecture at the Lowell Institute and elsewhere during the winter.

Professor A. C. Coolidge of Harvard, Professor William R. Shepherd of Columbia, and Dr. Hiram Bingham of Yale were among the delegates appointed by the Secretary of State to represent the United States at the first Pan-American Scientific Congress, held at Santiago de Chile in the concluding days of December.

When these pages appear the American Historical Association will have had its twenty-fourth annual meeting, occurring at Washington on December 28 and 29 and at Richmond on December 29-31. The meeting in Washington is made especially notable by the joint session with the American Political Science Association, at which the British Ambassador, the Right Honorable James Bryce, reads his inaugural address as president of that society, and by a reception offered by him and by Mrs. Bryce to the members of both societies at the British Embassy. The meeting at Richmond opens with the inaugural address of Professor George B. Adams, as president of the American Historical Association, an address printed in the present issue of this journal, and closes with a session devoted to the history of the Wilderness campaign, discussed by one of the last surviving generals of the Confederacy, and one of its most eminent military critics, General E. P. Alexander, by Colonel William R. Livermore, U. S. A. retired, and by Major Eben Swift of the General Staff, U. S. A. The Mississippi Valley Historical Association holds its semi-annual meeting in Richmond at the same time. After the close of the sessions there is an excursion to Charlottesville on New Year's day, upon invitation of the University of Virginia.

An extensive account of the International Congress for the Historical Sciences, held at Berlin in August, will be found in the weekly numbers of the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* from August 22 to October 3 inclusive. Another is in the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, XI. 3, Nachrichten und Notizen, II., and another by M. Gabriel Monod, in the *Revue Historique* for November-December. The address read by Dr. David J. Hill, American ambassador in Berlin, at the opening session of the Congress, which

was printed in English in the last number of this journal, appears in its German text in the *Neue Revue*, number 20, with the title "Der ethische Beruf des Geschichtsschreibers".

A report of the third International Congress for the History of Religions, held at Oxford from September 15 to 18, is published in the *Nation* of October 1. The official report of the Congress in two volumes has been published by the Clarendon Press.

The Library of Congress has acquired the private library of the late H. J. Hvitfeldt-Kaas, formerly the state archivist of Norway, a collection of over five thousand volumes. It has also received, as gifts, the papers of Judge Harry Innes, illustrating the early history of Kentucky, and those of the Washington banking firms of Riggs and Company and Corcoran and Riggs.

Macmillan has issued the second volume of Professor E. Westermarck's *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1908, pp. xv, 852).

F. Heman's comprehensive *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes seit der Zerstörung Jerusalems* (Stuttgart, Vereinsbuchhandlung, pp. 600) contains many details regarding the Jews in the Orient and Occident in early and modern times, with separate chapters on their relations with Islam and their history in Spain, France, England, Italy, Germany and Poland.

An English translation of the *History of the Papacy*, by Professor Gustav Krüger, of Giessen, a comprehensive survey of the subject from St. Peter down to the present day, will be published by Mr. Fisher Unwin.

It is announced by the Hakluyt Society that Messrs. William Foster and Basil H. Soulsby are preparing an "Abstract of and Index to the First Series", volumes 1-100, of the publications of the society.

A lucid account of *The Law of Oresme, Copernicus, and Gresham* (Philadelphia, Allen, Lane and Scott, 1908, pp. 21) and of the circumstances under which each of these students independently discovered the law, is given in a paper read before the American Philosophical Society, April 23, 1908, by Thomas Willing Balch, and separately printed. The same author is publishing through the same house *L'Évolution de l'Arbitrage Internationale*, printed last summer in the *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée*.

The *Transactions* of the Asiatic Society of Japan, vol. XXXV., part II., contains a valuable article on the historical connections between Buddhism and Christianity by Professor Arthur Lloyd, and an essay on Food and Wealth by a medieval Japanese author.

ANCIENT HISTORY

At the instance of the Committee for Anthropology six lectures were delivered at Oxford University in Michaelmas Term of this year by

A. J. Evans, Andrew Lang, Gilbert Murray, F. B. Jevons, J. L. Myres and W. W. Fowler, on the European Diffusion of Primitive Pictography and its Bearings on the Origin of Script; Homer and Anthropology; The Early Greek Epic; Graeco-Italian Magic; Herodotus and Anthropology; and Lustratio. The Clarendon Press has published these lectures under the title *Anthropology and the Classics* (1908, pp. 191).

Full lists with hieroglyphic characters of Egyptian royal names found on the monuments, with preliminary chapters on Egyptian royal names and Egyptian chronology and a list of papers bearing thereon, are given by Dr. A. E. Wallis Budge in *The Book of the Kings of Egypt* (Kegan Paul, 1908, pp. lxxxviii, 195, 281), vols. XXIII. and XXIV. of the series of "Books on Egypt and Chaldaea".

The first volume of *L'Ancienne Égypte d'après les Papyrus et les Monuments*, by M. Eugène Revillout of the Louvre, treats of the romance of chivalry and *chanson de geste* in ancient Egypt; historical romance; apologue; the middle age of Pharaonic Egypt in art and customs; religion and patriotism; and psychology in Egyptian art.

The Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne has published through A. and C. Black a work on *The Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah*.

The second volume of Walter Otto's important work on *Priester und Tempel im Hellenistischen Ägypten* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1908, pp. vi, 417) contains chapters on Die Ausgaben der Tempel, Die Kultusverwaltung, Die Soziale Stellung der Priester, and Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche.

Mrs. Harriet Boyd Hawes has published an account of the excavations of the Wells-Houston-Cramp expeditions in 1901, 1903 and 1904, under the title *Gournia, Vasiliki, and other Prehistoric Sites on the Isthmus of Hierapetra, Crete*. The large folio volume also includes a catalogue *raisonné* of finds, monographs on Minoan civilization, and twenty-four photogravure plates. Only three hundred copies will be issued. Orders should be sent to Mrs. C. H. Hawes, Madison, Wisconsin.

Among the papers in the thirty-eighth volume of the *Transactions* of the American Philological Association are "The Theatre as a Factor in Roman Politics under the Republic", by Professor F. F. Abbott, and "The Distribution of Oriental Cults in the Gauls and the Germanies", by Professor C. H. Moore.

The first volume of an authorized translation of the seventh enlarged and revised edition of Ludwig Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte Roms* has been published by L. A. Magnus under the title *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* (Dutton, 1908, pp. xxviii, 428).

The condition of the slave in private law from Augustus to Justinian is set forth in *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge University Press, 1908, pp. 735) by W. W. Buckland, fellow and tutor of Gonville and Caius College.

Mr. E. G. Hardy's second series of *Studies in Roman History*, treating of the Armies and Frontier Relations of the German Provinces, the Four Emperors' Year, and a Military Game of Chess, will be published early in the year by Sonnenschein.

Claudian as an Historical Authority, by Dr. J. H. E. Crees, the Thirlwall prize essay of 1906 with an additional chapter coming down to the death of Stilicho in 408, is being published by the Cambridge University Press.

The second and concluding part of *Le Siam Ancien* (Paris, Leroux, forty-eight plates), a work of archaeology, epigraphy and historical geography, by M. L. Fournereau, has been published by the Musée Guimet.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. H. Howorth, *The Germans of Caesar*, II. (English Historical Review, October).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

A posthumous work by Professor Charles Bigg on *The Origin of Christianity* is being seen through the Oxford University Press by Dr. T. B. Strong, Dean of Christ Church, and will, it is hoped, be published early in this year.

A collection of papers on early Christian history, *Lukan and Pauline Studies*, by Sir W. M. Ramsay, is being published through Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton.

The *Expositor* for November contains an article by W. M. Calder entitled "A Fourth-Century Lycaonian Bishop", which contains the text of a long Greek inscription recently discovered by Mr. Calder at Laodiceia Combusta, which Sir W. M. Ramsay describes as "one of the outstanding and exceptional historical documents that the soil of Anatolia has preserved to modern times".

Two works were published last year on the economic and social philosophy of St. Augustine in their relation to Christian ethics. In *Das Wirtschaftsprogramm der Kirche des Mittelalters* Professor Theodor Sommerlad argues that Augustine's economic and social theories differed widely from those of the Gospel, while Professor Ignaz Seipel takes a different view in his volume on *Die Wirtschaftsethischen Lehren der Kirchenväter* (Vienna, Mayer).

Professor W. K. Prentice of Princeton University has published through the Century Company the third part of the *Publications* of the American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900, a volume of *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, with translations, which in many instances throw light on the life and thought of early Christian communities in Syria.

Documentary publications: C. Schmidt, *Der Erste Clemensbrief in Altkoptischer Uebersetzung* [Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXII. 1]. (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1908, pp. 160.)

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Under the title *Jordanes: the Origin and Deeds of the Goths* (Princeton, 1908, pp. ix, 100) Dr. C. C. Mierow has printed, as part of his doctoral thesis, the first English version that has appeared of the *Getica* of Jordanes.

The English Correspondence of Saint Boniface, translated and edited, with an introductory sketch of the life of St. Boniface, by E. J. Kylie, is a recent addition to the series of King's Classics (Chatto and Windus).

Die Datierung in der Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts (Griefswald, 1908, pp. 92), a scholarly dissertation by Paul Hildebrand, a pupil of Professor Ernst Bernheim, supplements the similar studies by H. Hinrichs (1907) and E. Moll (1898), which relate to the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively.

A document of great importance to historians of the Crusades and of the Moslem East in the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been edited by M. H. F. Amedroz under the title *Ibn al Qalānisi: History of Damascus* (Leyden, Brill, 1908, pp. 48, 397). Besides the Arabic text of the history the book contains important unpublished fragments of other authors, and, in the introduction, a résumé of the work.

The Clarendon Press has recently published an important treatise of the celebrated Abbot of Clairvaux under the title *Saint Bernard on Consideration* (1908, pp. 169). The work is now first translated into English by G. Lewis.

A recent publication of the Görres-Gesellschaft is Dr. Paul Maria Baumgarten's work entitled *Von der Apostolischen Kanzlei: Untersuchungen über die Päpstlichen Tabellionen und die Vizekanzler der Heiligen Römischen Kirche im XIII., XIV., und XV. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, Bachem, 1908, pp. 186).

The first volume published by the British Society of Franciscan Studies, is a *Liber Exemplorum ad Usus Praedicatorum* (Aberdeen, 1908, pp. 177), a manual for the use of preachers, preserved in manuscript in the Library of Durham Cathedral. The book was compiled between 1270 and 1279 by an English Franciscan for some time resident in Ireland, and is the earliest work of its kind by a Franciscan that has been printed. It reveals the standard of taste and morals and the mental attitude of the writer and of those for whom he wrote, but it contains no allusion to Franciscan ideas or legends and adds extremely little to our knowledge of events. The editor is Dr. A. G. Little.

In the *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1908, 4, W. Meyer prints two thirteenth-century poems on the history of the Cistercians, and the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* for May–August, contains a fourteenth-century defense of the same order, printed by N. Valois.

An important article entitled *Die Heilige Elisabeth und Papst Gregor IX.*, published by Karl Wenck, in the review *Hochland* for November, 1907, has been separately issued through the house of Jos. Kösel, Munich.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. La Mantia, *Capitoli Angioini sul Diritto di Sigillo della Cancelleria Regia per la Sicilia posteriori al 1272* [Extract from the *Archivio Storico Siciliano*, XXXII. (1907)] (Palermo, pp. 26); E. Göller, *Zur Geschichte des Päpstlichen Sekretariats* (Quellen und Forschungen, XI. 2); A. Fierens, *La Question Franciscaine: Le Manuscrit II. 2326 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*, con. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, October); H. Grauert, *Aus der Kirchenpolitischen Traktatenliteratur des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXIX. 3); A. Bayot, *Un Traité Inconnu sur le Grand Schisme dans la Bibliothèque des Ducs de Bourgogne* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, October).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

An *Illustrierte Sittengeschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, by Eduard Fuchs (Munich, Langen), which is being published in parts, will be completed in three volumes, each containing four hundred and fifty text illustrations and from fifty to sixty double-page illustrations.

The second volume of Dr. J. E. Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge University Press, 1908) extends from the revival of learning to the end of the eighteenth century in Italy, France, England and the Netherlands. Volume three treats of the eighteenth century in Germany and the nineteenth century in Europe and the United States.

In the Görres-Gesellschaft series of *Studien und Darstellungen*, Dr. O. Hartig has edited a posthumous work of Dr. R. Stauber, a study of *Die Schedelsche Bibliothek* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1908, pp. xvi, 277), which is a contribution to the history of the spread of the Italian Renaissance, of humanism, and of medical literature.

The contents of the first volume of *Die Renaissance in Briefen von Dichtern, Künstlern, Staatsmännern, Gelehrten und Frauen*, edited by Dr. Lothar Schmidt (Leipzig, Klinkhardt and Biermann, 1908), are: Einleitung; Der Briefstil; Der Brief der Humanisten der Italienischen Frührenaissance; Der Brief bei den Humanisten des 15. Jahrhunderts; Der Religiöse Brief in Siena; Der Bürgerliche Brief in Florenz.

In the October number of this REVIEW (p. 198) we referred to Father E. Palandri's dissertation on *Les Négociations Politiques et Religieuses entre la Toscane et la France à l'Époque de Cosme I^{er} et de Catherine de Médicis (1544-1580), d'après les Documents des Archives de l'État à Florence et à Paris*. This work has now been issued through Picard, with an appendix of documents occupying fifty pages.

A *Missionsatlas der Brüdergemeinde*, published through the Moravian Brethren's Missions-Buchhandlung, Herrnhut, contains eighteen charts with explanatory texts, and valuable geographical and historical data.

An *Allgemeine Geschichte des Zeitungswesens* has been issued in the Sammlung Götschen (Leipzig, Götschen, pp. 180) by Ludwig Salomon, the author of an excellent *Geschichte des Deutschen Zeitungswesens*, in three volumes.

Modern Constitutions (University of Chicago Press, 1908), by Dr. W. F. Dodd, contains the English text of the constitutions or fundamental laws of the Argentine Nation, Australia, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States.

Geschichte der Neuzeit: Das Nationale und Soziale Zeitalter seit 1815 (Berlin, Ullstein, 1908, pp. xix, 648) forms the sixth volume in Professor J. von Pflugk-Harttung's *Weltgeschichte*.

M. de Martens is about to publish the fifteenth volume of his great work on the diplomatic relations of Russia with foreign powers, *Recueil des Traités et Conventions conclus par la Russie avec les Puissances Étrangères*. Besides the texts of the diplomatic documents it includes a survey of Russia's diplomatic relations with France from 1823 to 1857.

The Bernstorff Papers: the Life of Count Albrecht von Bernstorff, by Dr. Karl Ringhoffer, has been translated by Mrs. C. E. Barrett-Lennard and M. W. Hoper, with an introduction by Sir Rowland Blennerhassett (Longmans, 1908, 2 vols.). Count Bernstorff was the Prussian representative at the English court for many years, notably during the Crimean War and the Franco-German War.

The first volume of Adolphe de Circourt's *Souvenirs d'une Mission à Berlin en 1848* (Paris, Picard) has been edited by M. Georges Bourgin, archivist at the Archives Nationales, for the Society of Contemporary History.

An Austrian Diplomatist in the Fifties (Cambridge University Press, 1908), the Rede Lecture of 1908, by Sir Ernest Satow, treats of Hübner, whose journals of his residence in Paris as Austrian representative from 1849 to 1859 were published in 1904.

M. Austin Tardieu's *France and the Alliances* (Macmillan, 1908, pp. x, 314) is the outcome of lectures delivered by him in 1907 before the French Circle of Harvard University. The book describes the political relation of France to the other powers, including the United States, since the Franco-Prussian War, presenting an outline history of European diplomacy during this period.

The second part of the British *Official History of the Russo-Japanese War* (Wyman) begins after the battle of the Yalu and goes up to, but does not include, the battle of Liao-Yang. While the first part was issued in 1906 by the General Staff, this second part has been prepared by the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence. *The*

Russo-Japanese War: the Ya-lu, prepared in the Historical Section of the German General Staff, has been translated by Lieutenant Karl von Donat and published by Messrs. Hugh Rees.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Willaert, *Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas Catholiques (1598-1625): Intervention des Souverains Anglais en Faveur du Protestantisme aux Pays-Bas*, concl. (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, October); P. Hiltbrandt, *Preussen und die Römische Kurie in der Zweiten Hälfte des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, XI. 2); L. André, *La Candidature de Christine de Suède au Trône de Pologne (1668)* (*Revue Historique*, November-December); J. H. Rose, *The Franco-British Commercial Treaty of 1786* (*English Historical Review*, October); C. Mirbt, *Die Geschichtschreibung des Vatikanischen Konzils* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CI. 3); L. Renault, *L'Oeuvre de La Haye, 1899 et 1907* (*Annales des Sciences Politiques*, July).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

A Royal Commission has been appointed to inventory the monuments and constructions connected with, or illustrative of, the culture, civilization and conditions of life of the people in England from the earliest times to the year 1700, and to specify those that seem most worthy of preservation. The Commission consists of Lord Burghclere, the Earl of Plymouth, Viscount Dillon, Lord Balcarras, Sir H. H. Howorth, Sir John F. F. Horner, Mr. E. J. Horniman, Professor F. J. Haverfield, Mr. L. Stokes, vice-president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Mr. J. Fitzgerald, assistant secretary to H. M. Office of Works, and Mr. J. G. N. Clift, honorary secretary to the British Archaeological Association.

In W. Johnson's volume entitled *Folk-Memory, or the Continuity of British Archaeology* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908, pp. 416), the author aims at "a co-ordination and recombination of scattered facts selected from the great storehouse". He treats of the Stone and Bronze Ages at length, agriculture and marling, deneholes, old roads, etc. A chapter of references and bibliography fills 32 pages.

Mr. Hubert Hall's *Studies in English Official Historical Documents* (Cambridge, University Press, 1908, pp. xv, 404) will be of inestimable aid to the student and record-worker. Part I. treats of the history, classification and analysis of archives and of the bibliography of English official historical documents with numerous illustrative appendices. "The Diplomatic of Official Historical Documents", and "The Palaeography of Official Documents" are the subjects of the second and third parts. From the same press and edited by Mr. Hall comes *A Formula Book of English Official Historical Documents*, part I., *Diplomatic Documents, 704-1837* (1908, pp. xvi, 170), selected and transcribed by a seminar of the London School of Economics, and containing concrete examples of

diplomatic composition, based on the classification adopted in the *Studies*, with a diplomatic description of the several documents and indications of their *provenance* and bibliographical relations.

Asser's Life of King Alfred (Chatto and Windus, 1908, pp. lviii, 163), translated with introduction and notes by L. C. Jane, has been issued in the series of the King's Classics. There are at least four other English translations of this work of which the last, by Professor Cook of Yale, was published in 1906.

Students of social and economic history will welcome Mr. George Unwin's volume on *The Gilds and Companies of London* (Methuen, 1908, pp. 397), published in the series of "The Antiquary's Books". The author traces the continuous organic development of these bodies from the twelfth to the nineteenth century, and emphasizes their significance for the constitutional history of the city and for the social and economic development of the nation. The book contains an interesting chapter on the Place of the Gild in the History of Western Europe, and numerous illustrations.

E. V. Vaughn, instructor in history in the University of Missouri, has published a study of *The Origin and Early Development of the English Universities to the Close of the Thirteenth Century* (University of Missouri Studies, Social Science Series, II. 2, 1908, pp. 147) which attempts "to trace the corporate development of these two English universities during the thirteenth century and to outline the steps by which they gradually approached an independent position in the polity of the Middle Ages".

Dr. James Gairdner, whose knowledge of the sources of Henry VIII's reign is probably unrivalled, has published an historical survey of *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (Longmans, 1908), the two volumes of which extend from the time of Wyclif to the end of the reign of Henry VIII.

Dr. Karl Stählin of Heidelberg has undertaken to fill a gap in English biographical literature by a two-volume work on *Sir Francis Walsingham und seine Zeit* (Heidelberg, Winter). The first volume (1908, pp. xiv, 662) comes down to 1573. The second volume will continue the history to 1590 and will include a survey of the printed and of the abundant manuscript material in English and foreign archives on which the work is based.

Professor Foster Watson's volume on *The English Grammar Schools to 1660* (Cambridge University Press, 1908) is a history of the curriculum and practice of the schools in distinction from the history of the theories of educational reformers. The attempt has been to describe representative documents and school text-books.

Messrs. Billing and Sons of Guildford, Surrey, have issued proposals for the publication of "Original Records of Early Nonconformity under

Persecution and Indulgence", by Professor G. Lyon Turner, in two volumes. These will present a transcript of the Episcopal Returns for 1665 and 1669 as contained in volume 639 of the manuscript department of the Lambeth Palace Library, and the documents connected with the issue of licenses under the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 as preserved in the Record Office. These are records of the greatest value, unknown or unavailable to the early historians of Nonconformity. Elaborate indexes will assist in making available the information which they contain.

J. B. Williams has published through Longmans *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the "Gazette"* (1908, pp. 306), the object of which is to show who the journalists during the Civil War were, what their work was, and what is its value. A catalogue of periodicals from 1641 to 1666 is included.

The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660, by George L. Beer, is now out (Macmillan, pp. viii, 438).

In his somewhat digressive *Early History of the Tories*, from the accession of Charles II. to the death of William III. (Smith Elder, 1908, pp. 498), Mr. C. B. Roylance Kent pays special attention to the doctrines of this party.

The bicentenary of Chatham's birth has been commemorated by special exhibitions of manuscripts at the Public Record Office and the British Museum, and by a meeting of the Royal Historical Society on November 16, at which Mr. Frederic Harrison delivered an address, and Dr. Hunt and Mr. Julian Corbett spoke. An account of the commemoration, with some remarks on the need of an historical bibliography of Chatham, is published in the *Athenaeum* of November 21.

A new "Life of William Pitt the Younger", by Dr. J. Holland Rose, including much new information from private sources and from the Foreign Office, is being published by Messrs. Bell.

The Panmure Papers (Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), a selection from the correspondence of Fox Maule, second Baron Panmure, afterwards eleventh Earl of Dalhousie, edited by Sir George Douglas and Sir George Dalhousie Ramsay, with a supplementary chapter by the late Rev. Principal Rainy, includes nearly 200 letters of Queen Victoria, almost all unpublished, and letters from the Prince Consort and Lord Palmerston, etc., and throws new light on the Crimean War.

Mr. Bernard Mallet's biography of *Thomas George, G. C. S. I., Earl of Northbrook* (Longmans, 1908) devotes special attention to Lord Northbrook's career as viceroy in India.

Longmans will publish early in this year the first and second volumes of *Ireland under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum*, by Dr. Richard Bagwell, author of *Ireland under the Tudors*.

British government publications: *Calendar of Close Rolls*, Edward I., vol. V., 1302-1307; *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, Henry VI., vol. IV., 1441-1446; *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic*, of the Reign of Henry VIII., vol. XXI., part 1.; *List of War Office Records*, I.; *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* on the manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., preserved at Dropmore, vol. VI.

Other documentary publications: A. O. Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers* (Nutt, 1908) [from the earliest time to 1286]; Herbert Maxwell, *Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1280*, I. (Scottish Historical Review, October) [translation]; G. W. Forrest, *Selections from the Travels and Journals preserved in the Bombay Secretariat* (Bombay, Government Central Press) [the documents cover the period from 1826 to 1843 and relate to the region east and west of the Indus and to Southern Arabia and Abyssinia].

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. G. Bayne, *The First House of Commons of Queen Elizabeth*, II. (English Historical Review, October); C. Brinkmann, *England and the Hanse under Charles II.* (English Historical Review, October); P. Mantoux, *Les Transformations Récentes de la Constitution Anglaise* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, August); D. Pasquet, *L'Évolution de l'Église Anglicane, principalement au XIX^e Siècle* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, August); Theodora Keith, *Scottish Trade with the Plantations before 1707* (Scottish Historical Review, October).

FRANCE

A valuable guide for workers in the field of French history has been compiled by M. Léon Vallée, librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, under the title *Catalogue des Plans de Paris et des Cartes de l'Ile de France, de la Généralité, de l'Élection, de l'Archevêché, de la Viscomté, de l'Université, du Grenier à Sel et de la Cour des Aydes de Paris, conservés à la Section des Cartes et Plans* (Champion, 1908, pp. 576). The excellent subject-index (pp. 438-576) shows that the material described, which includes diagrams and charts as well as maps and plans, relates not only to the topography of Paris, but to all phases of the life of the community—commerce, industry, medicine, hygiene, etc.

La Commune de Soissons et le Groupe Communal Soissonnais, by G. Bourgin (Paris, Champion, 1908, pp. lxxi, 495), forms number 167 of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études.

Andrew Lang's *Maid of France: Being the Story of the Life and Death of Jeanne d'Arc* (Longmans, 1908, pp. 379) is based on a thorough study of the documents and is equipped with full references.

The committee on the diplomatic archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announces that volume II. (Baden to Danzig) of the *Inventaire Sommaire de la Correspondance Politique* is nearly finished, and that it is hoped that volume III. (Espagne to États-Unis) will appear in 1909.

It is proposed also to print the "état sommaire" of the Correspondance Politique ("inventaire vert"). Five new volumes of the *Recueil des Instructions aux Ambassadeurs*, relating respectively to England, the Germanic Diet, the Netherlands, Turkey and Venice, will also soon be sent to the press, leaving but two small volumes, relating to the minor states of Germany and Italy, to complete this series.

Miss Geraldine Hodgson's *Studies in French Education from Rabelais to Rousseau* (Cambridge University Press, 1908) fills a gap in educational literature in English.

The third and concluding volume of M. F. Strowski's *Histoire du Sentiment Religieux en France au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, Plon) is entitled *Pascal et son Temps* and deals especially with the *Provinciales* and the *Pensées*.

M. Alfred Rébelliau, of the University of Paris, has issued an important documentary work, *La Compagnie Secrète du Saint-Sacrement* (Paris, Champion, 1908), containing the letters sent from the "companions" of Paris to those of Marseilles from 1639 to 1662.

The *Histoire de la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes à Bordeaux (1653-1715)*, by Paul Bert, is a complete documentary work on one diocese. Also based upon the sources but written from a Catholic standpoint is the third volume of the Abbé Rouquette's *Études sur la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes en Languedoc: Les Fugitifs (1685-1715)*.

A valuable contribution to the history of trade and French firms in India from 1664 to 1719 is made by Paul Kaepelin in *La Compagnie des Indes Orientales et François Martin* (Paris, Challamel).

A. Gazier has written from unpublished documents *Une Suite à l'Histoire de Port-Royal* (Société Française d'Imprimerie et de Librairie, 1908) which deals with the years from 1750 to 1782.

G. Lenôtre's *Vieilles Maisons, Vieux Papiers* has been translated into English by F. Lees under the title *Romances of the French Revolution* (Heinemann, 1908, pp. 361, 336). A new work by the same author, *Le Tribunal Révolutionnaire* contains unpublished documents, plans and details of buildings, and many particulars illustrative of its subject.

F. M. Kircheisen's very elaborate *Bibliographie du Temps de Napoléon* (Paris, Champion) notices the political, economic, literary and military books of the Napoleonic era in Europe and in the United States. The first volume has appeared and the second is in press.

Gustave Davois has published the first volume of *Bibliographie Napoléonienne Française jusqu'en 1908* (Paris, L'Édition Bibliographique, 1908), which will be complete in three volume.

Ernest Daudet's *Récits des Temps Révolutionnaires* gives new information on the plot of 1800 against the First Consul.

Events of the past few years have turned the attention of many stu-

dents to the history of the church in France. A work that seems assured of the highest rank among such studies is P. Pisani's *L'Église de Paris et la Révolution* (Paris, Picard, 1908) of which the first volume deals with the years 1789 to 1792, down to the massacres of September. Its author is a canon of Nôtre Dame. With this may be compared *La Politique Religieuse de la Révolution Française* (Paris, Rousset) written from an opposing standpoint by Émile Lafond.

The second volume of *L'Église et l'État en France depuis le Concordat jusqu'à nos Jours (1801-1906)*, by Professor G. Desdevise du Désert, has been published by the Société Française d'Imprimerie et de Librairie.

In Lieutenant E. L. Bucquoy's elaborate doctoral thesis on *Les Gardes d'Honneur du Premier Empire* (Nancy, Crépin-Leblond, 1908, pp. 487) the author treats of both kinds of *gardes d'honneur*, the local and non-military, and the national regiments, of the development in Napoleon's mind of the idea of a guard composed of the élite, and of his attempts to utilize the local *gardes d'honneur*.

Mr. F. Loraine Petre, whose valuable works on *Napoleon's Campaign in Poland*, *Napoleon's Conquest of Prussia*, etc., we have noticed (XII. 888, XIII. 140), has recently published a history of the Franco-Austrian campaign in the valley of the Danube in 1809, entitled *Napoleon and the Archduke Charles* (Lane, 1908, pp. 413).

Vers la Bérésina, 1812 (Paris, Plon, 1908), by Major-General B. R. F. Van Vlijmen, is a study of the campaign of Napoleon in Russia based on unpublished documents.

Commandant M. H. Weill is publishing through the house of Fontemoing, Paris, a work in five volumes on *Joachim Murat, Roi de Naples, la Dernière Année de Règne, Mai, 1814-Mai, 1815*.

F. H. Cheetham's *Louis Napoleon and the Genesis of the Second Empire* (Lane, 1908, pp. xx, 394) comes down to the election of Napoleon to the presidency in 1848. The book is illustrated from contemporary portraits, prints and lithographs.

Pierre Lehautcourt's authoritative *Histoire de la Guerre de 1870* is concluded with the issue of the seventh volume on the Capitulation of Metz, August 19 to October 29, 1870. The work has twice been awarded the second Grand Prix Gobert of the French Academy.

The governor-general of Algeria has decided upon the organization of the Algerian archives, and has appointed M. R. Busquet to direct the new service. He is to arrange the archives of the general government and inventory the departmental or communal dépôts. A commission will be appointed to publish an official collection of documents on the history of Algiers.

Documentary publications: Ph. Lauer and Ch. Samaran, *Diplômes Originaux des Mérovingiens; facsimilés photographiques avec notices et*

transcriptions (Paris, Leroux, 1908, pp. ix, 31; 48 plates); A. Chuquet, *Cent Lettres Inédites de Bonaparte, 1793-1796* (Annales Révolutionnaires, April-June); Baron de Vitrolles, *Souvenirs Autobiographiques d'un Émigré: La Duchesse de Courlande* (Revue Historique, November-December); Count Karl von Monts, *Tagebuch über Napoleons III. Gefangenschaft auf Wilhelmshöhe*, edited by Fräulein Tony von Held (Berlin, Mittler).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. F. Delaborde, *Les Archives Royales depuis la Mort de Saint Louis jusqu' à Pierre d'Étampes* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, May-August); P. Bernus, *Le Rôle Politique de Pierre de Brezé au Cours des Dix Dernières Années du Règne de Charles VII. (1451-1461)* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, May-August); A. Girard, *La Réorganisation de la Compagnie des Indes, 1719-1723*, I. (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, October); L. Dutil, *L'Industrie de la Soie, à Nîmes jusqu'en 1789* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne, June-July); P. Sagnac, *Le Crédit de l'État et les Banquiers à la Fin du XVII^e et au Commencement du XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne, June-July); J. Letaconnoux, *Les Transports en France au XVIII^e Siècle*, I. (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, November); Ch. Bournisien, *La Vente des Biens Nationaux: la Législation* (Revue Historique, November-December).

ITALY AND SPAIN

In Italy much attention is being paid to the preservation of monuments. Gaetano Moretti, who for seventeen years has held the office of superintendent of the monuments of Lombardy, has recently published a work on *La Conservazione dei Monumenti della Lombardia* (Milan, Allegretti) which includes a detailed inventory of the historical monuments of that region. Corrado Ricci, the new director of antiquities, has initiated the preparation of an illustrated catalogue of all the works of art in Italy. One volume will be devoted to each commune and the whole series will comprise some 8000 volumes.

The second volume of Alfred Doren's *Studien aus der Florentiner Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1908, pp. xxii, 802) treats of the guilds of Florence from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century.

A new series of documentary publications relating to the finance and public economy of the states of Savoy in the century preceding the French Revolution has been initiated by the issue of an introductory volume, *La Finanza Sabauda all' Aprirsi del Secolo XVIII. e durante la Guerra di Successione Spagnuola* (Turin, Soc. Tip.-Ed. Nazionale, pp. xxxii, 455) by L. Einaudi, who discusses the finances of the state in time of peace and of war.

The late General Stefano Türr bequeathed all of his documents, maps, autographs and memoirs relating to the Risorgimento to the Vittorio

Emanuele Library at Rome, which already possessed a large collection of documents on this period.

A valuable contribution to the history of the Risorgimento period has been made by Baron Helfert in his *Geschichte des Lombardo-Venezianischen Königreichs* (Vienna, Holder), which deals with the history of the kingdom after the fall of Napoleon.

The house of A. F. Formigini, Modena, is publishing a history of *L'Istruzione Popolare nello Stato Pontificio (1824-1870)* by E. Formigini-Santamaria, based on materials drawn from the archives and libraries of the former Pontifical State. The headings of the main divisions of the work are: The scholastic legislation of the Pontifical State; public opinion respecting instruction; organization of the schools.

In connection with the centenary of the birth of Garibaldi, the communal council of Bologna offers for international competition a prize of ten thousand francs for the best historical work on the Expedition of the Thousand. It may be written in Italian, French, English or German, should be well documented and definitive, and should be presented to the commune of Bologna before June 3, 1910.

Documentary publications: L. Schiaparelli, *I Diplomi dei Rei d'Italia: Ricerche Storico-Diplomatiche*, Parte III., *I Diplomi di Lodovico III.* (Bollettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano, 1908, vol. XXIX.); P. Kehr, *Nachträge zu den Papsturkunden Italiens*, II. [1065-1196] (Nachrichten von den Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1908, 2).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Schneider, *Toscanische Studien*, II. (Quellen und Forschungen, XI. 2).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND

The second division of K. Rhamm's vast work, *Ethnographische Beiträge zur Germanisch-Slawischen Altertumskunde*, deals with *Urzeitliche Bauernhöfe im Germanisch-Slawisches Waldgebiet*. The first part of this division has been published in a large volume entitled *Altgermanische Bauernhöfe im Uebergange vom Saal zu Fletz und Stube* (Brunswick, Vieweg, 1908, pp. xxxii, 1117).

A contribution to medieval textual criticism and cosmography is made by Dr. P. W. Kohlmann in his study of the ecclesiastical historian *Adam von Bremen*, published in the series of *Leipziger Historische Abhandlungen* edited by Professors Brandenburg, Seeliger and Wilcken (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer).

In celebration of Professor Gustav Schmoller's seventieth birthday, the Verein für Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg has published a volume of *Beiträge zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, 1908, pp. viii, 493), to which the following historians have contributed: Fr. Holtze, F. Hirsch, W. Stolze,

F. Arnheim, G. Kuntzel, O. Krauske, M. Hass, Fr. Freiherr von Schroetter, P. Bailleu, O. Tschirch, Th. Schiemann (on Nicholas I. and Frederick William IV. respecting the plan to convoke a united Diet), R. Koser, A. von Ruville, P. Schwarz, M. Tangl and O. Hintze. Most of the papers treat of the seventeenth century or later, although M. Tangl deals with the documents of Otto I. for Brandenburg and Havelberg as models for the falsified documents of the Saxon bishoprics.

Professor Henry Simonsfeld has published in the *Sitzungsberichte* (Munich, Franz) of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Phil.-hist. Kl., the fourth installment of his contribution on *Urkunden Friedrich Rotbarts in Italien* (1908, pp. 48).

Germany in the later Middle Ages, 1200-1500 (Longmans, 1908, pp. 205), by the late Bishop Stubbs, completes the series of lectures on Germany of which the first volume was reviewed in our October number, pp. 167-168.

Under the general editorship of Professor C. G. Herbermann the Catholic Historical Society of New York City College has brought out a facsimile of Waldseemüller's *Cosmographiae Introductio*.

In the series of *Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte*, edited by Professors von Below, Finke and Meinecke (Berlin, Rothschild) Dr. Hans Goldschmidt has a volume on *Zentralbehörden und Beamtentum im Kurfürstentum Mainz vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (pp. xx, 209); and Dr. Erich Kober publishes a study of *Die Anfänge des Deutschen Wollgewerbes* (pp. vii, 113).

The second volume of the collection of biographies, *Unsere Religiösen Erzieher*, edited by Professor B. Bess (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer) contains the following studies: Luther, by Professor Th. Kolde; Zwingli, by A. Baur; Calvin, by the editor; Spener, by P. Grünberg; Goethe and Schiller, by K. Sell; Schleiermacher, by O. Kirn; Bismarck, by O. Baumgarten; and Die Religion der Erzieher, by Professor W. Herrmann.

In George Winter's two-volume biography of *Friedrich der Grosse* (Berlin, E. Hofman) the author pays special attention to Frederick's management of internal affairs.

An important study of the history of Catholicism in Germany from 1848 to 1870 is made by Georges Goyau in the third and fourth volumes of his work, *L'Allemagne Religieuse* (Paris, Perrin, 1908). The preceding volumes dealt with the years 1800 to 1848.

In the eighth number of the *Geschichte des Fürsten Bismarck in Einzeldarstellungen*, edited by J. Penzler (Berlin, Trewendt), Dr. K. Herrfürth treats of *Fürst Bismarck und die Kolonialpolitik* (1909, pp. xii, 439).

A collection of 670 letters of Calvin in German translation by R. Schwarz, with an introduction by Professor Paul Wernle, is being published by the house of Mohr, Tübingen. The attempt has been to select

the most significant of Calvin's letters from the 1400 printed in the *Corpus Reformatorum*.

Documentary publications: E. Graber, *Die Urkunden König Konrads III.* (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1908, pp. viii, 130).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Schultze, *Über Gästerecht und Gastgerichte in den Deutschen Städten des Mittelalters* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CI. 3); H. D. Foster, *Calvin's Programme for a Puritan State in Geneva* (*Harvard Theological Review*, October).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The State Commission on the preparation and edition of a descriptive inventory of the historical and artistic monuments in the Netherlands has published its fifth report, for the year 1907. The inventory for the province of Utrecht will soon be published and that of southern Holland is nearly completed. An index to the periodical literature relating to the monuments published from 1900 to 1906 inclusive, will be issued in the *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond*.

The *Bulletin Bibliographique du Musée Belge* for July contains a résumé of an excellent discourse by Professor G. Kurth on the life and deeds of Notger, the first prince-bishop of Liège, delivered in commemoration of the ninth centenary of his death.

Georges Smets, a pupil of the late Professor L. Van der Kindere, has published a monograph on *Henri I., Duc de Brabant, 1190-1235* (Brussels, 1908, pp. xxii, 340), the first part of which sets forth in annalistic form all that is known of Henry I. from his birth in 1165 to his death in 1235, while the second part is a synthetic account of the history of his reign.

A Linschoten Society, patterned after the Hakluyt Society, has been organized by a number of Dutch scholars. The first of its series of publications, of which two volumes will be issued yearly, will be the *Itinerary* of Jan Huyghen van Linschoten, edited by Professor Kern. This will be followed by Cornelis Houtman's first voyage to the East Indies, and *Verscheide Voyagiens* by David Pietersz de Vries. The address of the secretary of the society is 18 Nobelstraat, the Hague.

Dr. S. van Brakel has published a work of much value on *De Nederlandsche Handelscompagnieën der zeventiende Eeuw* (The Hague, Nijhoff, 1908).

The first volume of *Matériaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Dentelle en Belgique* (Paris, Lamartin, 1908) is by E. Van Overloop and G. Des Marez.

Documentary publications: H. Reimers, *Friesische Papsturkunden aus dem Vatikanischen Archive zu Rom* (Leeuwarden, Meijer and Schaafsma, 1908, pp. viii, 126); F. J. L. Krämer, *Archives ou Corre-*

spondance Inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau, third series, II., 1697-1700 (Hague, Nijhoff, 1908, pp. xxxviii, 603).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Keutgen, *Zur Geschichte Belgiens im Mittelalter* (Historische Zeitschrift, CI. 3).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The first installment of an index to more than 4000 articles on Norwegian topography in seventy-five periodicals, arranged alphabetically under names of places, has been published by the Deichmanske Bibliothek in Christiania.

Under the title *Islandica, I.*, a bibliography of the Icelandic sagas and minor tales, by Halldor Hermansson, remarkably complete and extending down to 1264, has been issued by the Cornell University Library.

An English Bibliography on the Near Eastern Question, by Voyslav M. Yovanovitch, is being published by the Servian Royal Academy (Belgrade, Svetislav Tzviyanovich) as the forty-eighth part of the *Spomeniks*, second series. It consists of 1600 entries, from the year 1480 to 1906.

The second volume of Professor N. Jorga's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* (1908, pp. viii, 380) comes down to the year 1538. The work, which is written from the sources, is issued in Professor Lamprecht's series *Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten* (Gotha, Perthes).

A vast amount of information concerning the different races of the Balkan Provinces is contained in Signor Amadori-Virgili's first volume of nearly a thousand pages on *La Questione Rumeliota e la Politica Italiana* (Bitonto, Garofalo), which also contains sketches of the history of the various states. The second volume will deal more particularly with Italian policy towards this region.

K. Zdravomyslov has published a brochure entitled *Sviedienia o Konsistorskikh Arkhivakh i Tserkovnoarkheologhicheskikh Utchrejdeniakh v Eparkhiakh* (Saint Petersburg, 1908), notices of the archives of the consistories and of the archaeological ecclesiastical institutions in Russia. Historical information is given concerning sixty-four archives of the Russian eparchies, and concerning thirty-five committees or archaeological societies devoted to the study of ecclesiastical antiquities.

Professor Leopold Karl Goetz has published through the house of Duncker, Berlin, a study of *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland* (1908, pp. viii, 214) treating of the Kiev period from 988 to 1240.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: O. J. Skattum, *Ofir-Studier: Historisk-geografiske Undersøgelser over det Salomoniske Guldlands Beliggenhed* (Skrifter udgivne af Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania, hist.-fil. Kl., 1907, 4).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government, appointed at the instance of the President by the Committee on Department Methods, held its third and final meeting in Washington on October 23 and 24. On that occasion and by subsequent correspondence it completed an elaborate report, which has been transmitted to the members of the Committee on Department Methods, has been approved by them, and is now in the press.

Writings on American History, 1907, the second issue in a series of annual bibliographies of which the volume for 1906 has lately appeared, is approaching completion under the editorial care of Miss Grace G. Griffin, and may be expected to be published in the spring.

The *Guide to the Manuscript Materials for the History of the United States to 1783*, etc., by Professor Andrews and Miss Davenport, will apparently be published in January.

Mr. James Schouler is publishing through Little, Brown and Company a volume entitled *Ideals of the Republic*, based on the author's lectures at Johns Hopkins University.

A work on *United States Constitutional History and Law*, by A. H. Putney, has been published by the Illinois Book Exchange, Chicago.

The *Monthly Catalogue of United States Public Documents* for September, 1908, issued by the Superintendent of Documents, has a useful note of several pages on the history of the publication of United States statutes by the government.

Mr. Asher C. Hinds's *Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives*, in eight volumes, has been issued from the Government Printing Office.

The Century Company have published *The American Executive*, by President Finley of the College of the City of New York.

A reference book on tariff legislation and debates in Congress from 1846 to 1897, prepared by Mr. G. H. Boyd, superintendent of the Senate document room, has been presented by the chairman of the Finance Committee and referred to the Committee on Printing. It contains tariff acts in full together with the committee reports thereon, and full references to all debates.

A Study of Primary Elections, by Professor C. E. Merriam, has been issued by the University of Chicago Press. The development of legal regulation of primaries from 1866 to 1908 is traced and general tendencies are discussed.

Doubleday, Page and Company have brought out *Studies in the American Race Problem*, by Alfred H. Stone. Mr. Walter F. Willcox of Cornell University contributes to the volume an introduction and three papers.

Mr. Burton E. Stevenson has edited a large volume of *Poems of American History* which Houghton, Mifflin and Company will publish.

The November *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains an extensive list of books relating to witchcraft in the United States.

As Others See Us is the title of a book to be published shortly by the Macmillan Company, in which Mr. John Graham Brooks has brought together the recorded opinions of America expressed by sundry critics from Tocqueville to Bryce. Upon these quoted opinions Mr. Brooks offers his own comparisons and criticisms.

The American Antiquarian Society will publish in its *Proceedings* for October a calendar of those miscellaneous manuscripts relating to the French and Indian War which are possessed by the Society. This will supplement the installments previously published relating especially to the papers of Sir William Johnson and of Colonel John Bradstreet. The same number will also contain note-books of Dr. Saugrain relating to a journey in the Ohio country in 1788, and an article on early South American newspapers, by Mr. George P. Winship.

Among the several articles in the July number of the *Magazine of History* may be mentioned "Blockading Memories of the Gulf Squadron", by the late Lieutenant S. W. Powell, and Mr. D. T. V. Huntoon's third paper on Major-General Richard Gridley. In the August number are brief articles on "The Camp on the Neshaminy", by C. H. Jones; "Florida County Names", by G. B. Utley; and Mr. H. E. Hamilton's second paper on Gurdon S. Hubbard. Among the original documents in these numbers are a letter from General Henry Dearborn to his son, November 25, 1807, and some letters of Washington and Lincoln. In the September issue is the first paper of a series by Leon Hühner entitled "Some Jewish Associates of John Brown". The same issue offers its readers a part of Mr. H. M. Baker's address "Why did Benjamin Thompson (Count Rumford) become a Tory", and also a part of Mr. H. A. M. Smith's recent address on General Thomas Sumter.

The *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society begin in the June issue the publication of "Some Correspondence Relating to the Dioceses of New Orleans and St. Louis", with notes by the Abbé Lionel St. G. Lindsay. The letters are from the archiepiscopal archives at Quebec. In the same issue are printed some letters from the Baltimore archives, of the time of Bishop Carroll, with annotations by Rev. E. I. Devitt, S. J. The series of letters from the first Catholic Bishop of Charleston is concluded in this number.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

G. P. Putnam's Sons will soon publish *Bartholomew Las Casas: his Life, his Apostolate and his Writings*, by F. A. MacNutt.

A decree of Philip IV., signed at Madrid March 22, 1638, assuring

to the Duke of Veragua the American possessions of his ancestor Columbus, was recently found in New Orleans and is now in the possession of the Library of Congress.

It is announced that the next publication of the Club for Colonial Reprints, of Providence, will be "A Scheme for a Paper Currency together with Two Petitions written in Boston Gaol in 1739-1740", by Richard Fry. Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis contributes an introduction.

The Writings of George Washington, edited by Professor Lawrence B. Evans of Tufts College, the first volume in Messrs. Putnam's series of "Writings of American Statesmen", will shortly come from the press.

Several pages of the October issue of the *American Catholic Historical Researches* are devoted to Catholic Loyalists of the Revolution and Catholic Officers in the Revolution.

The University Library of Princeton has issued a volume by V. L. Collins entitled *The Continental Congress at Princeton (1783)*.

A discussion of the contributions of Charles Pinckney to the Constitution of the United States, by Hon. Charles C. Nott, former chief justice of the United States Court of Claims, has been published by the Century Company under the title *The Mystery of the Pinckney Draught*.

The September *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains three letters written to James Monroe in 1812 and 1814, one of which, by George Hay, is of considerable interest.

Mr. William K. Bixby of St. Louis has published privately, from originals in his possession, a volume of *Letters of Zachary Taylor, from the Battlefields of the Mexican War*.

Books on Lincoln continue to multiply. From the Macmillan Company comes *Abraham Lincoln; the Boy and the Man*, by James Morgan; from the McClure Company, *The Boyhood of Lincoln*, by Eleanor Atkinson, and *The Death of Lincoln*, by Clara E. Laughlin; from A. Wessels Company, *The Wisdom of Lincoln*, extracts from Lincoln's letters, speeches and state papers, edited by Dr. M. M. Miller, and *Abraham Lincoln: a Tribute*, by George Bancroft.

Charles Scribner's Sons have published *Robert E. Lee, the Southerner*, by Thomas Nelson Page.

'Stonewall' Jackson, by H. A. White, is to appear shortly from the press of George W. Jacobs and Company. The volume is included in the *American Crisis* series.

Captain S. A. Forbes has reprinted from the *Transactions* of the Illinois Historical Society a careful and interesting paper on *Grierson's Cavalry Raid*.

The War-Time Journal of a Georgia Girl, by Eliza F. Andrews, which has been appearing serially, has been issued as a volume by the firm of Appleton.

The third volume of the *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, prepared for the press by Dr. Frederic Bancroft and Professor William A. Dunning from material left by Mr. Schurz, is on the eve of publication by the McClure Company.

It is understood that President Finley of the College of the City of New York is engaged in writing a biography of President Grover Cleveland.

Recollections of a Varied Career, by Gen. William F. Draper of Massachusetts, formerly congressman and ambassador to Italy, is published by Little, Brown and Company.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Dr. Lois Kimball Mathews, instructor in history in Vassar College, has completed the manuscript and maps for her book "New England on the Frontier: a Study of the Spread of New England Sentiment and Institutions from 1620 to 1865". The book is to be brought out by the Houghton, Mifflin Company in the spring.

Mr. Albert Matthews is preparing a bibliography of New England magazines of the eighteenth century.

The *Manchester Historic Association Collections*, volume IV., part I. (Manchester, N. H., 1908) includes two addresses delivered before the association upon the two-hundredth anniversary of the winter scout of Captain William Tyng and his snow-shoe men. The one is entitled "The Snow-Shoe Scouts", by G. W. Browne; the other is on "The Indian Wars in New Hampshire", by F. B. Sanborn. An interesting reprint is "A Discourse Utter'd in Part at Ammauskeeg-Falls, in the Fishing-Season, 1739", by Rev. Joseph Seccombe.

A life of Thomas Pownall, governor of Massachusetts, 1756-1760, has appeared in London from the press of Henry Stevens, Son, and Stiles, wherein the *Letters of Junius* are ascribed to Governor Pownall. The author is C. A. W. Pownall, and the full title of the work is, *Thomas Pownall, M. P., F. R. S., Governor of Massachusetts Bay, Author of the Letters of Junius*.

In the *Massachusetts Magazine* for July the article of chief historical interest is an account of Colonel William Prescott's regiment, by F. A. Gardner, concluded in October. In the "Pilgrims and Planters" department, conducted by Lucie M. Gardner, there is a sketch of Roger Conant. Brief accounts, accompanied by pictures, are given of some historical houses, among them the Paul Revere house and the old Royall house.

In the *Essex Antiquarian* of October is a paper on "Legal Qualifications of Voters in Massachusetts", treated historically.

The thirty-eighth volume of *Records relating to the Early History of Boston*, just published by the city registrar (pp. 378), contains the minutes of the meetings of the Selectmen from 1811 to September, 1818.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections* continues in the October number the publication of Revolutionary letters written to Colonel Timothy Pickering. Beginning with the issue of January, 1909, it is announced that some Revolutionary letters from Salem, and journals and military rolls of the Revolution, will be printed.

Dr. Samuel A. Green, librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society, a devoted student of the history and antiquities of his native town of Groton, has brought together in a volume of 181 pages *Three Historical Addresses at Groton, Massachusetts* (Groton, 1908), formerly printed as separate pamphlets. One is upon occasion of the centennial of 1876 and the bicentennial of the burning of Groton by the Indians; the second was delivered at the dedication of three monuments, and relates chiefly to Indian wars; and the third commemorated in 1905 the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the town. All are entertaining and of historical value.

Among the numerous documentary series appearing in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, that of chief historical interest is "Colonial Records of Marlborough, Massachusetts", compiled by F. P. Rice.

The *Mayflower Descendants* is publishing Plymouth Colony deeds, and Plymouth Colony wills and inventories.

The Story of Roger Williams, by E. J. Carpenter, has been added to the *Grafton Historical* series.

The Connecticut Historical Society has recently received the manuscript diary of Rev. David Avery, covering the years 1771-1777, 1779-1786, 1789-1791. Mr. Avery was for one year of the period covered by the diary a missionary to the Oneida Indians, for three years a chaplain in the Revolution, and at other times held various pastorates.

A History of Otsego, New York, by S. B. Blakely, has been published in New York City by the author.

In the September and October issue of the *German-American Annals* is a brief article, by Mr. J. G. Rosengarten, on "The Palatines in New York and Pennsylvania".

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has received as a gift the papers of Thomas Wharton of Philadelphia, amounting to about 4600 pieces.

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* prints as its leading article in the April issue an address, delivered before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania by Hon. Hampton L. Carson, on the "Dramatic Features of Pennsylvania's History". About twenty-five pages of this issue are occupied by selections from the military papers of General John Cadwalader. Among these are several letters from Washington to Cadwalader, letters of Joseph Reed, Tench Tilghman,

and others. Of especial interest are General Cadwalader's address to the Council of Safety, January 15, 1777; Tilghman's letter to Cadwalader, January 18, 1778; and Washington's letter to Cadwalader, October 5, 1780. "Some Account of James Hutton's Visit to Franklin, in France, in December of 1777", is a paper, largely documentary, presenting the main facts in Hutton's endeavor as confidential agent of the king to bring about a reconciliation of the colonies to the mother-country. The chief feature of the July issue is a study of Anthony Wayne, by Governor S. W. Pennypacker.

The principal articles in the *Pennsylvania German* for September are: "The Ancestral Home of the Pennsylvania Germans", by Professor J. F. L. Raschen, and "The Pennsylvania German in the Revolutionary War", by H. M. M. Richards.

Vol. XXIX. of the *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen* of the Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht (Amsterdam, Johannes Müller, 1908, pp. lxix, 442) is of the greatest interest to the student of Swedish colonization on the Delaware, containing 38 letters of Samuel Blommaert to the Swedish chancellor, Count Axel Oxenstjerna, 1635-1641, which cast invaluable light on the origins of New Sweden. The volume also contains 84 letters of Louis de Geer, further illustrating Dutch enterprise in Sweden. It is edited by Professor G. W. Kernkamp.

The principal article in the September issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* is Dr. Bernard C. Steiner's paper on Benedict Leonard Calvert. The magazine reprints from the original in the British Museum *Babylon's Fall*, a very rare pamphlet dealing with the conflict between the Parliamentary and Proprietary forces in 1655. From the Calvert papers is printed "Proceedings of the Parochial Clergy" (1753). "The Case of the Good Intent" is continued.

The chief contents of volume II. of the *Records of the Columbia Historical Society* (Washington, 1908, pp. 418) are a survey of the Federal Archives by Mr. Waldo G. Leland, an account of Old Georgetown by Mr. Hugh T. Taggart, and a reprint of a valuable series of annual accounts of the progress of material improvements in the city of Washington, which John Sessford, a clerk in the Treasury Department, contributed to the *National Intelligencer* from 1823 to 1860.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* prints in the issue for October several documents of interest and value. The most noteworthy items in the Randolph Manuscript are the commission to Sir William Jones and others to examine into the state of Virginia, May 9, 1624; the commission of Yeardley as governor during the absence of Wyatt, September 18, 1625; and the commission of Governor John Harvey and Council, March 26, 1627/8. The Journals of the Council of Virginia in Executive Sessions (March 4, 1760, to April 3, 1767) relate largely to Indian affairs. Of chief importance among the Virginia

Legislative Papers are a petition of the inhabitants of Kentucky to the Virginia Convention, June 7-15, 1776, and a petition of the Committee of West Fincastle, June 20, 1776. Of interest also are letters from Van Bibber and Harrison, commercial agents of the colonies at St. Eustatia in 1776, and a letter from Colonel William Christian to Brig.-Gen. Rutherford of North Carolina, August 18, 1776.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* reprints in its October issue (from *Some Prominent Virginia Families*, by Louise Pecquet du Bellet) the "Narrative of George Fisher", describing his voyage to America in 1750 and his residence in Virginia and Pennsylvania to 1755. In the same issue is printed a letter of James C. Jewett to General H. A. S. Dearborn, dated Washington, February 5, 1817, describing some speeches in Congress, particularly one by John Randolph.

Dr. John W. Wayland's useful book on *The German Element of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia* has now been completed by the addition of an elaborate index. The book is published by Dr. Wayland, University Station, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Volume I. of the *Publications* of the Historical Commission of North Carolina bears the title *Literary and Historical Activities of North Carolina* (Raleigh, E. M. Uzzell and Company, 1907, pp. viii, 623). Much of the volume is devoted to descriptions of these activities as manifested in historical and literary organizations, schools, colleges and libraries. In this category may be included the pages of "North Carolina Bibliography" for the years 1902 to 1905 inclusive, prepared mainly by Professor D. H. Hill. A number of addresses on historic occasions are here printed, also several historical papers credited to the *North Carolina Booklet*. Among the addresses may be mentioned that of T. M. Pittman on Nathaniel Macon, that of J. P. Caldwell on Andrew Jackson, that of W. P. Bynum, jr., on Thomas Settle and that of R. H. Battle on Z. B. Vance. Of the several original papers in the volume attention may be called to the following: "Pampticoe and Bath, North Carolina", by Lida T. Rodman; "Sir Walter Raleigh and His Colonies", by W. J. Peele; "North Carolina in the War between the States", a group of articles on various war episodes, and "The Genesis of Wake Forest College", by E. W. Sikes. Of interest also is Dr. Stephen B. Weeks's account of his collection of Caroliniana.

The Census Bureau, in its publication of *Heads of Families at the First Census, 1790*, has just issued the volume for North Carolina (pp. 292).

Among the contents of the *Annual Publication of Historical Papers*, series VII., published by the Historical Society of Trinity College, is an article of interest by Earl R. Franklin on "The Instruction of United States Senators by North Carolina". In the "Selections from the Cor-

respondence of Bedford Brown (1859-1868)" are found letters of M. W. Ransom, D. S. Dickinson and Martin Van Buren.

The October number of the *South Carolina Historical Magazine* contains, besides further installments of Lafayette letters, etc., an interesting article on Commodore Alexander Gillon and the Frigate *South Carolina*, by Mr. D. E. Huger Smith.

Recent additions to the *Colonial Records of Georgia*, edited by Allen D. Candler and published by the state, are as follows: Vols. 8-12 contain the "Proceedings and Minutes of the Governor and Council", 1754-1782. The great bulk of this material prior to 1774 is the record of land-granting on the basis of headrights. In 1775 the Liberty Boys figure prominently. From 1779 to 1782 the proceedings recorded are those of the royal administration in Savannah during the occupation of that city by the British army. Vols. 13 to 15 contain the "Journal of the Commons House of Assembly", 1755-1782. The journal is apparently complete to 1772, but fragmentary thereafter. Vol. 16 begins the "Journal of the Upper House of Assembly", carrying it from 1755 to 1762. The editor has provided each volume since the third with an index; but the paper and binding, as before, leave much to be desired.

The Mississippi Historical Society has just published the first of a new series of bulletins. This present issue contains the proceedings and papers of recent meetings of the Mississippi Association of History Teachers. It is expected that volume X. of the *Publications* of the society will be ready for distribution by the first of March.

The Official and Statistical Register of the State of Mississippi, 1908, by Dr. Dunbar Rowland, Director of the Department of Archives and History of Mississippi, contains not only a large amount of information, statistical and other, in regard to the state of Mississippi and its various institutions (it is a volume of more than thirteen hundred pages), but also valuable historical matter. The most important sections, additional to the matter which appeared in the issue of the *Register* for 1904, are: Lists of officials of Mississippi Territory, 1798-1817, including those of the original counties, 1798-1802; biographies of the governors (both of the territory and of the state); a digest of legislation, 1904-1906; and a military history of Mississippi from 1803 to 1898 (563 pages). There are a number of maps showing the growth and development of the state, and many portraits and other illustrations.

Mention was made in our April number (XIII. 704) of a proposed calendar of the series of volumes of manuscripts in the archives of the Ministry of the Colonies at Paris, which is entitled "Correspondance Générale de la Louisiane", and attention was called to the high importance which that series has for the history of Louisiana and of the whole Mississippi Valley and to the value which such a calendar would therefore have for students of American history. It is a pleasure

to be able to report that the proposed volume is now announced for publication during the course of the year 1909, under the title *Inventaire Sommaire de la Correspondance Générale de la Louisiane, 1678-1819*. The volume, which is prepared by MM. P. Nicolas, *chef de Bureau*, and O. Wirth, attaché in the Colonial Archives, will be one of considerable size, with a full index. The price to early subscribers is fifteen francs, postpaid; after April 1 it will be advanced to twenty francs. Subscriptions may be sent to M. Augustin Challamel, Éditeur, 17 rue Jacob, Paris VI.

Volume IV. of the *Publications* of the Louisiana Historical Society (New Orleans, 1908, pp. 200) contains beside the record of the society's transactions a considerable body of French documents relating to the Mississippi Valley and extending in date from 1679 to 1769. Their place of origin is not indicated but they are of great intrinsic interest. The volume also contains a chronological statement, unfortunately not furnished with precise references, of a variety of documents relative to Louisiana to be found in the Archivo Historico Nacional in Madrid.

The *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association prints in its July issue the second part (1847-1869) of "The Records of an Early Texas Baptist Church", and the "Recollections of S. F. Sparks", a soldier in the war between Texas and Mexico.

The article of chief interest in *The "Old Northwest" Genealogical Quarterly* for July is "John Armstrong of Kittanning and his Sons", by J. E. Pilcher.

The Department of Archives and History in the Indiana State Library has recently acquired a valuable collection of historical material gathered during a period of more than half a century by the late Charles B. Lasselle of Logansport. The collection embraces, besides many early newspapers, a valuable mass of manuscripts connected with the early history of Vincennes and with other portions of the territorial period of the state's history.

In the *Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History* for September appear three papers relating to Henry Clay's visit to Richmond, Indiana, in 1842, two of them reprinted from Indiana newspapers. The contributors are C. W. Osborn, C. F. Coffin and W. H. Coffin. Mention may also be made of "Pioneer Transportation on the Ohio River", by S. T. Covington, and an autobiographical sketch of Judge Isaac Naylor, 1790-1873. The *Quarterly* reprints the memorial of the inhabitants of what was then (1804) the northern portion of Indiana Territory petitioning Congress to create that region into a new territory.

The Macmillan Company have published *History and Civil Government of Indiana*, by E. L. Hendricks.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons announce for autumn publication *Historic Indiana*, by Julia H. Levering.

To the September issue of the *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society Col. J. Stoddard Johnston contributes a paper on the Kentucky-Tennessee Boundary Line, Mr. Z. F. Smith a sketch of Transylvania University, and Mr. L. J. Johnson a chapter in his "History of Franklin County" dealing with the period 1800 to 1810. "Chronicles of the Old Neighborhood", by Mrs. Jennie C. Morton, is presented as a supplement to Mr. Johnson's history.

A Financial and Administrative History of Milwaukee, by Laurence M. Larson, is *Bulletin No. 242 of the University of Wisconsin* (pp. 182). The work includes some study of administrative methods and changes as well as of municipal finance, and is of especial interest as showing the strivings and economic development of a city from very raw beginnings.

Volume XII. of the *Minnesota Historical Society Collections* (pp. 830) contains the papers and addresses presented in the society's meetings during the past three years. The society at the same time publishes volume XIII. (pp. 480), *The Lives of the Governors of Minnesota*, by General James H. Baker, who was secretary of the state of Minnesota from 1860 to 1862, has been personally acquainted with all of the eighteen governors of the territory and state and has taken an active part in its politics since 1857. *Minnesota in Three Centuries*, issued to subscribers during November, consists of four volumes: the first, by Dr. Warren Upham, secretary of the society, covers the history of explorations and events to the founding of Fort Snelling in 1820; the second, by Mr. Return I. Holcombe, extends to the end of the territorial period in 1858; the third, by General Lucius F. Hubbard and Mr. Holcombe, proceeds to 1870, and relates chiefly to the Sioux outbreak and to the period of the Civil War; while the fourth volume, by Mr. Frederick R. Holmes, includes the remaining period and the general index.

Houghton, Mifflin and Company have published *Minnesota: the North Star State*, by W. W. Folwell, in the *American Commonwealth* series.

The Missouri Historical Society has recently acquired an interesting and valuable collection of French and Spanish papers, containing marriage contracts, sales, wills, etc., filed at the town of St. Charles when it was a Spanish post prior to the acquisition by the United States. The society has also had placed with it for safe keeping volumes I.-VI., each containing 52 numbers of *The Brunswicker*, published at Brunswick, Missouri, 1847-1853. It also has volumes III. and IV., containing 52 numbers each, of the *Glasgow News*, published at Glasgow, Missouri, in 1845-1847.

The *Missouri Historical Society Collections* continues in the April issue the "Journal of Stephen Watts Kearney". The portion here printed begins with July 22, 1820, and closes with August 19, when the party reached St. Louis. Another document of interest is printed under the general title "The Beginning of Spanish Missouri". It is the instruc-

tions given by Ulloa to Captain Francisco Rui for an expedition from New Orleans to the Illinois country. The instructions (25 pages in extent) are dated Balize, March 14, 1767. In the next issue of the *Collections* will be printed a document describing the manner in which Rui carried out his instructions. Still another document is a list of the landowners of St. Louis in 1805, together with the valuations of their holdings.

In the *Missouri Historical Review* for October Mr. W. G. Bek of the University of Missouri gives the history of "A German Communistic Society in Missouri", a society which existed from 1844 to 1879 under the leadership of Dr. William Keil and had its seat near the present town of Bethel. A paper by Judge John L. Thomas entitled "Some Historical Lives in Missouri" is mainly a rehearsal of events centring about the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Thomas J. Bryant, writing of "Bryant's Station and its Founder, William Bryant", endeavors to correct some errors relative to this noted station and its founder.

The Story of a Border City during the Civil War, by Dr. Galusha Anderson (Little, Brown and Co.), is a war-time chronicle of St. Louis based upon Dr. Anderson's personal observations.

Volume II. of the *Publications of the Arkansas Historical Association* (pp. 600), edited by Mr. J. H. Reynolds of Fayetteville, has just appeared. It contains a chapter on the History of Taxation in Arkansas, by Professor D. Y. Thomas; one on the battle of Prairie Grove, by C. W. Walker; one on Confederate manufactures in southwest Arkansas, by H. B. McKenzie; and the official orders of Governor Flanagin, the war-governor of Arkansas. On the period of Reconstruction there is a history of the Brooks-Baxter war, by Benjamin S. Johnson; a history of Reconstruction in Arkansas County, by Judge W. H. Halliburton; and accounts of the "Pope County Militia War", and of the history of the Catholic, the Baptist and Presbyterian churches. In December the association brought before the legislature of Arkansas a bill providing for a permanent state history commission with a salaried secretary located at the capital whose duties will be to take charge of the archives of the state, to collect all possible historical material and to publish such original documents as are of historical value. The bill also provides for the continuation of the publications of the Arkansas Historical Association at the expense of the state.

The October issue of the *Annals of Iowa* contains a number of "Old Letters", edited by William Salter. Those by James W. Grimes and Henry Dodge, of the years 1857-1859, are of chief interest. The *Annals* prints also a diary kept by William Edmundson, of Oskaloosa, while crossing the Western plains in 1850.

Under the title *A Canyon Voyage* Messrs. Putnam have issued a narrative by F. S. Dellenbaugh of the second Powell expedition down

the Green-Colorado River from Wyoming, and of the explorations on land, in the years 1871 and 1872.

In the series of *Studien und Forschungen zur Menschen- und Völkerkunde*, directed by G. Buschan (Stuttgart, Strecker and Schröder), Dr. H. Eickoff has published a monograph on *Die Kultur der Pueblos in Arizona und New Mexico* (1908, pp. viii, 78).

The principal article in the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for September is by T. W. Davenport, on "The Slavery Question in Oregon". The "Free-State Letter" of Judge George H. Williams is reprinted from the *Oregon Statesman* of July 28, 1857.

The Champlain Society of Toronto has decided to undertake, with Mr. H. P. Biggar as editor, a translation of the complete works of Champlain, and at the same time to reprint the French text. The whole work will run to four considerable volumes. The publications of the society are in limited editions of 500 copies—250 for members and 250 for subscribing libraries.

The Macmillan Company have published *The Tercentenary History of Canada*, in three volumes, by Frank B. Tracy.

The *Quebec Daily Telegraph* will shortly publish *The Quebec Tercentenary Commemorative History*, compiled and edited by Frank Carrel and Louis Feiczewicz, revised by E. T. D. Chambers, with introduction by Dr. A. G. Doughty.

How Canada was Won, by Captain F. S. Brereton, primarily the story of Wolfe and Quebec, will shortly appear from the press of H. M. Caldwell Company.

The principal paper in the *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society*, volume XIII. (Halifax, 1908, pp. xi, 188), is "The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wiswall, M. A., a Loyalist Clergyman in New England and Nova Scotia, 1731-1821", by Rev. E. M. Saunders. George E. E. Nichols contributes "Notes on Nova Scotian Privateers", relating to the war periods from 1756 to 1815. "Recollections of Old Halifax" (his own and other people's) is contributed by W. M. Brown.

Señor V. Salado Álvarez, formerly a secretary of the Mexican embassy in Washington, has prepared from materials in the Washington archives and in those of Mexico a valuable pamphlet entitled *La Conjuración de Aaron Burr y las Primeras Tentativas de Conquista de México por Americanos del Oeste* (Mexico, Museo Nacional, 1908, pp. 64). The pamphlet contains the text of several Spanish documents from the Spanish archives and a reproduction of Burr's Mexican map.

Porfirio Díaz, by Rafael de Zayas Enríquez, is written for the most part from the point of view of an admirer of Díaz. The work is translated by T. Quincy Browne, jr., and is published by D. Appleton and Co.

A recent number in the *Münchener Volkswirtschaftliche Studien*, edited by L. Brentano and W. Lotz, is Dr. W. Hegemann's *Mexikos Übergang zur Goldwährung: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Mexicanischen Geldwesens, 1867-1906* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1908, pp. xii, 189).

Bibliografía de la Revolución de Yara: Folletos y Libros Impresos de 1868 á 1908, by Luis M. Pérez (Havana, Imprenta Avisador Comercial, 1908, pp. x, 73) is the initial publication of a comprehensive bibliography of the Cuban Revolution planned by the author, to cover articles in periodicals, fugitive publications and manuscripts as well as books and pamphlets. The present issue contains 368 items. The work abounds in descriptive notes and cross-references.

Saint Domingue (1629-1789) (Paris, Perrin, 1908), by Pierre de Vaissière, is an account of Creole life and society in that island during the Old Régime.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Griselle, *Lettre Inédite d'un Acadien à Richelieu en 1627* (*Études*, October 5) [the writer of the letter is De la Tour]; D. E. Mowry, *Political and Party Aspects of the National Judiciary*, II. (*American Historical Magazine*, September); J. W. Thompson, *Anti-Loyalist Legislation during the American Revolution* (*Illinois Law Review*, October); Max Farrand, *The Federal Constitution and the Defects of the Confederation* (*American Political Science Review*, November); W. F. Dodd, *The First State Constitutional Conventions, 1776-1783* (*ibid.*); R. S. Rodgers, *Closing Events of the War with Tripoli, 1804-1805* (*United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, September); H. L. Carson, *Pennsylvania's Defiance of the United States* (*Harper's Magazine*, October); Captain C. G. Calkins, U.S.N., *Decatur and Coleridge* (*United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, September); F. T. Hill, *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates: Fifty Years After* (*Century Magazine*, November); G. H. Putnam, *The London Times and the American Civil War* (*Putnam's*, November); E. R. Shaw, *The Assassination of Lincoln; the Hitherto Unpublished Account of an Eye-Witness* (*McClure's Magazine*, December); W. L. Fleming, *Jefferson Davis, the Negroes and the Negro Problem* (*Sewanee Review*, October); C. F. Smith, *Robert E. Lee Once More* (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, October).